

Executive Summary

ES-05 Executive Summary

1. Introduction

The Consolidated Plan for Housing and Community Development is a report which informs the community, stakeholders and the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) how the City of Kent (hereinafter referred to as “the City”) will invest its Community Development Block Grant from 2013-2017. The report also identifies the objectives and strategies that will guide the City’s investment. Objectives and strategies are fueled by the City’s overarching goal to build a healthy community.

2. Summary of the objectives and outcomes identified in the Plan Needs Assessment Overview

The outcomes and objectives are as follows:

- Accessibility to decent housing
- Accessibility to a suitable living environment
- Accessibility to economic opportunities

To accomplish these outcomes and objectives, the City invests in programs that meet community basics, increase self-reliance, strengthen children and families, and build a safer community.[1]

[1]These funding priorities were identified in the City of Kent Human Services 2007 – 2012 Master Plan, *Building a Healthy Community*.

3. Evaluation of past performance

During the past four years, the City realized significant gains on its investments and improved the lives of many Kent residents.[1] Outcomes were as follows:

Accessibility to decent housing

- 318 households received home repair assistance
- 141 persons received transitional housing and case management
- 15 households received shelter

Accessibility to suitable living environment

- 179 persons received housing stability grants
- 170 persons received medical services
- 164 persons were connected to services and information
- 16 homeless persons received outreach and case management
- 52 persons received emergency assistance and case management
- 1 public facility was improved[2]
- 1 playground was improved

Accessibility to economic opportunities

- 132 persons were enrolled in micro-enterprise business training classes

[1]Data on FY12 will not be available until January 1, 2013.

[2]American Recovery and Reinvestment Act Funds of 2009 (ARRA CDBG-Recovery) were used for this project.

4. Summary of citizen participation process and consultation process

The City of Kent, Division of Housing and Human Services, consulted with intercity departments, government agencies, public and private agencies, mental health organizations, the local housing authority, organizations serving persons with HIV/AIDS, agencies serving people with disabilities, refugee and immigrant organizations, organizations working with seniors, faith-based institutions, the business community, Department of Social and Health Services, and foundations.

In addition, the City posted a community survey on its website requesting that residents and stakeholders complete the survey to help identify community needs and priorities for the Consolidated Plan and Human Services Master Plan. The survey was distributed widely to organizations, including the above-listed entities.

Focus groups on homelessness were another component of the citizen participation process. Residents, business leaders, members of faith institutions, homelessness service providers, and homeless individuals were convened to discuss the level of need, gaps in service and to share public concerns.

The City published a draft Consolidated Plan and Notice of Public Hearing on the City of Kent website. A public hearing was held on October 18, 2012. As a part of the consultation process, the City also held a listening session with the Kent Cultural Diversity Initiative Group at its October 9, 2012 meeting.

5. Summary of public comments

[To be added]

6. Summary of comments or views not accepted and the reasons for not accepting them

[To be added]

7. Summary

In summary, Kent residents, stakeholders, service providers and others consulted during the citizen participation process support the outcomes and objectives of the Consolidated Plan for Housing and Community Development. The remainder of this report will provide details on how the City proposes to prioritize its investment.

The Process

PR-05 Lead & Responsible Agencies

1. Agency/entity responsible for preparing/administering the Consolidated Plan

The following are the agencies/entities responsible for preparing the Consolidated Plan and those responsible for administration of each grant program and funding source.

| Agency Role | Name | Department/Agency |
|-------------|------|-------------------|
| Lead Agency | KENT | |
| | | |

Table 1 – Responsible Agencies

Narrative

The City of Kent, Housing and Human Services Division, is the lead agency for the CDBG Program. Katherin Johnson, Housing and Human Services Manager, is the program administrator. Dinah Wilson, CDBG Coordinator, is the primary staff responsible for the day to day implementation of the program. The City also worked closely with the King County Housing Authority (KCHA), which manages over 3,000 units of housing, including 546 public housing units in Kent. KCHA also provides Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers to another 1,321 low/moderate income households in the City[1]. KCHA gives preference for housing to families with children, seniors or disabled persons. Detailed information about KCHA is provided in the *Public Housing* sections of this document. In addition, several non-profit agencies are responsible for administering programs funded by CDBG and were consulted during the development of the Consolidated Plan. These agencies are listed in the *Annual Action Plan* section of this document.

[1]KCHA data base for addresses of Section 8 Vouchers located in one of the three primary zip codes in the City (98030, 98031, and 98032).

Consolidated Plan Public Contact Information

Katherin Johnson
Housing and Human Services Manager
City of Kent
220 4th Ave S
Kent, WA 98032
253.856.5070
kjohnson@kentwa.gov

PR-10 Consultation

1. Introduction

The City of Kent consulted with multiple entities, including South King County cities (the cities of Auburn and Federal Way are the two other entitlement cities in South County), the King County Housing Authority, King County Department of Community and Human Services, nonprofit agencies delivering services in Kent and the subregion and Washington State Department of Social and Health Services. The City of Kent carries out homeless planning and coordination as a regional issue. Kent works with the Committee to End Homelessness, King County, cities, mainstream systems, Safe Harbors, housing funders, community agencies, United Way, the private sector (including businesses), and homeless people.

Summary of the jurisdiction's activities to enhance coordination between public and assisted housing providers and private and governmental health, mental health and service agencies

Kent Housing and Human Services Division meets regularly with other King County jurisdictions, public housing authorities and State Departments to develop strategies and implement plans to improve the quality of service and access for low-income residents in the city and throughout the region. Additionally, the City participates in quarterly meetings with King County staff, including the Public Health Seattle/King County, to review implementation and delivery of services funded through regional efforts. The City will continue to participate in the Committee to End Homelessness, funding review panels for Continuum of Care (CoC), Emergency Shelter Grant and McKinney funding.

In 2012, the Coordinated Entry program was launched providing a single point of entry for homeless families. Housing providers, funders and government agencies provide support to this program. Kent requires that housing providers under contract with the city participate in Coordinated Entry and Safe Harbors, the Seattle/King County Homeless Information Management System (HMIS) program.

Describe coordination with the Continuum of Care and efforts to address the needs of homeless persons (particularly chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans, and unaccompanied youth) and persons at risk of homelessness

McKinney Continuum of Care - Supportive Housing Program (SHP)

SHP funds support transitional housing and related supportive services for people moving from homelessness to independent living, as well as permanent supportive housing for persons with disabilities. McKinney SHP funds are competitive federal dollars through the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). A Consolidated Application for SHP funds is submitted to HUD each year by the Seattle - King County CoC, which includes Seattle, all suburban communities, and King County. Because of the large number of projects in our continuum eligible for yearly renewal, the Seattle - King County CoC is currently eligible to apply for just under \$15.5 million which funds housing, supportive services and rental assistance to homeless people.

McKinney funding is critical to our region's implementation of the Ten-Year Plan to End Homelessness in King County. These funds help homeless persons meet three goals:

- Achieve residential stability
- Increase their skill levels and/or incomes
- Strengthen their ability to influence decisions that affect their lives

Since 1995, the City of Seattle and King County have applied for these funds on behalf of a regional consortium of service providers, and administered distribution of the money to approximately 70 programs operating throughout the county. Each program has a focus on a specific audience -- families, single adults, single women and single men, victims of domestic violence, veterans or persons with severe mental illness.

The Supportive Housing Program component of McKinney specifically helps people make the transition from homelessness to independent living. Other McKinney programs are the Emergency Shelter Grants Program for emergency shelter; Shelter Plus Care for permanent supportive housing, and Section 8 Moderate Rehabilitation for Single Room Occupancy Dwellings for Homeless Individuals, another permanent housing option.

The Ten-Year Plan to End Homelessness in King County offers a blueprint for how the region will work collaboratively to confront the issues that cause homelessness and create the housing and supportive services needed to end homelessness for the thousands of men, women and children who are not permanently housed. The plan, introduced in March 2005, has been approved by the Metropolitan King County Council and endorsed by cities representing 85 percent of the county's population, including Kent, as well as by dozens of social organizations and faith communities countywide. The Committee to End Homelessness in King County, made up of representatives from business, faith, social services, government, homeless and formerly homeless people and advocacy groups, is working to implement the Ten-Year Plan to End Homelessness in King County. The Plan calls for prevention of homelessness where possible, creation of new permanent housing, and providing supportive services to those who need them to maintain housing.

Describe consultation with the Continuum(s) of Care that serves the jurisdiction's area in determining how to allocate ESG funds, develop performance standards and evaluate outcomes, and develop funding, policies and procedures for the administration of HMIS

To receive McKinney funding, HUD requires applicants to work through a local Continuum of Care. For Seattle and King County, the Continuum of Care encompasses programs and activities within the borders of King County, including Seattle. Each continuum sets funding priorities and need for its community. The Seattle-King County CoC priorities are set by the Committee to End Homelessness in King County (CEHKC). Kent staff is on the CoC/McKinney Advisory Board and staff both the CEHKC Funders Group and Interagency Council.

2. Agencies, groups, organizations and others who participated in the process and consultations

| Agency/Group/Organization | Agency/Group/Organization Type | What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation? |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|
| Jewish Family Services of Seattle | Services-Employment | Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless |

Table 2 – Agencies, groups, organizations who participated

How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination
 Identify any Agency Types not consulted and provide rationale for not consulting

Other local/regional/state/federal planning efforts considered when preparing the Plan

| Name of Plan | Lead Organization | How do the goals of your Strategic Plan overlap with the goals of each plan? |
|-------------------|-------------------|--|
| Continuum of Care | | |

Table 3 – Other local / regional / federal planning efforts

Describe the means of cooperation and coordination among the state and any units of general local government in the metropolitan area in the implementation of its Consolidated Plan (91.220(l))

Narrative

PR-15 Citizen Participation

1. **Summary of citizen participation process/Efforts made to broaden citizen participation**
Summarize citizen participation process and how it impacted goal-setting

Citizen Participation Outreach

| Mode of Outreach | Target of Outreach | Summary of response/attendance | Summary of comments received | Summary of comments not accepted and reasons | URL (If applicable) |
|-------------------|--|--------------------------------|------------------------------|--|---------------------|
| Internet Outreach | Minorities Persons with disabilities Non-targeted/broad community Residents of Public and Assisted Housing | | | | |
| Public Meeting | Minorities Persons with disabilities Non-targeted/broad community Residents of Public and Assisted Housing non profit agencies | | | | |
| Other | Minorities | | | | |

Table 4 – Citizen Participation Outreach

Needs Assessment

NA-05 Overview

Needs Assessment Overview

Many sources were used to estimate the housing needs projected for the next five years. The main data source that the City used to estimate 2013-2017 housing needs was the HUD Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data taken from the 2000 Census (CHAS data from the 2010 census was not available for all data sets). CHAS data is gathered “to demonstrate the number of households in need of housing assistance.”[1]

In addition, the City considered comments received during the citizen public hearing, meetings, focus groups, electronic correspondence, and interviews with stakeholders and agencies working with low/moderate-income Kent individuals and families. Finally, the City reviewed comments received from those who responded to the *Citizen Participation Survey*.

Analysis Process Used to Determine Priority Needs

The City of Kent uses demographic data, community response, and stakeholder input to develop housing and human services priorities. City priorities, HUD national objectives, and eligible activities are the criteria used by the Kent Human Services Commission to select projects for CDBG funding.

[1]Department of Housing and Urban Development. *Data Sets, CHAS Background*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development http://www.huduser.org/portal/pdrdatas_landing.html (accessed August 8, 2012).

NA-10 Housing Needs Assessment

Summary of Housing Needs

Housing in the City of Kent is more affordable than other communities in the County. However low income households in Kent still have a greater share of cost burden than the rest of the city's households. Other factors such as housing condition and overcrowding contribute to the necessity for housing assistance in Kent. Households with an AMI of less than 30% are more likely to have an extreme cost burden, overcrowding and/or sub-standard condition impact their housing environment. Racial and ethnic communities often have large extended families needing larger living quarters. Kent has a scarcity of large units, particularly rentals, available that are also affordable. The following charts indicate the number of households needing assistance. It is anticipated this need will remain unchanged and could increase over the next five years depending on improvement in the economy. Work with the King County Comprehensive Plan(KCCP) committee indicates a primary need for the rehabilitation of existing housing that maintains affordability. Studies done by the KCCP show the most affordable housing in the County is located in South King County. Kent has the largest number of housing authority units, housing vouchers and other types of subsidized units.

| Demographics | Based Year: 2000 | Most Recent Year: 2009 | % Change |
|---------------|---------------------|---------------------------|----------|
| Population | 79,524 | 84,011 | 6% |
| Households | 32,488 | 32,023 | -1% |
| Median Income | \$46,046.00 | \$53,570.00 | 16% |

Table 5 - Housing Needs Assessment Demographics

Data Source: 2005-2009 ACS Data

Number of Households Table

| | 0-30% HAMFI | >30-50% HAMFI | >50-80% HAMFI | >80-100% HAMFI | >100% HAMFI |
|--|----------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Total Households | 5,134 | 4,665 | 6,230 | 3,339 | 0 |
| Small Family Households | 1,510 | 2,054 | 2,485 | 8,315 | 0 |
| Large Family Households | 760 | 470 | 760 | 1,259 | 0 |
| Household contains at least one person 62-74 years of age | 739 | 645 | 715 | 435 | 1,650 |
| Household contains at least one person age 75 or older | 519 | 535 | 410 | 184 | 590 |
| Households with one or more children 6 years old or younger | 1,299 | 1,229 | 1,575 | 2,459 | 0 |
| * the highest income category for these family types is >80% HAMFI | | | | | |

Table 6 - Total Households Table

Data Source: 2005-2009 CHAS

Housing Needs Summary Tables for several types of Housing Problems

1. Housing Problems (Households with one of the listed needs)

| | Renter | | | | | Owner | | | | |
|---|--------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------|--------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------|
| | 0-30% AMI | >30- 50% AMI | >50- 80% AMI | >80- 100% AMI | Total | 0-30% AMI | >30- 50% AMI | >50- 80% AMI | >80- 100% AMI | Total |
| Substandard Housing - Lacking complete plumbing or kitchen facilities | 60 | 35 | 55 | 45 | 195 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 30 |
| Severely Overcrowded - With >1.51 people per room (and complete kitchen and plumbing) | 145 | 34 | 15 | 4 | 198 | 0 | 15 | 4 | 0 | 19 |
| Overcrowded - With 1.01-1.5 people per room (and none of the above problems) | 365 | 340 | 275 | 49 | 1,029 | 0 | 45 | 75 | 35 | 155 |
| Housing cost burden greater than 50% of income (and none of the above problems) | 2,555 | 260 | 40 | 0 | 2,855 | 579 | 595 | 535 | 170 | 1,879 |
| Housing cost burden greater than 30% of income (and none of the above problems) | 560 | 1,899 | 944 | 40 | 3,443 | 110 | 265 | 815 | 699 | 1,889 |
| Zero/negative Income (and none of the above problems) | 140 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 140 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |

Table 7 – Housing Problems Table

Data

Source: 2005-2009 CHAS

2. Housing Problems (Households with one or more Housing problems: Lacks kitchen or bathroom, Overcrowding, cost burden)

| | Renter | | | | | Owner | | | | |
|---|-----------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------|-----------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------|
| | 0-30% AMI | >30-50% AMI | >50-80% AMI | >80-100% AMI | Total | 0-30% AMI | >30-50% AMI | >50-80% AMI | >80-100% AMI | Total |
| Having 1 or more of four housing problems | 3,130 | 670 | 390 | 104 | 4,294 | 579 | 655 | 645 | 205 | 2,084 |
| Having none of four housing problems | 1,075 | 2,700 | 3,330 | 1,349 | 8,454 | 195 | 635 | 1,865 | 1,679 | 4,374 |
| Household has negative income, but none of the other housing problems | 140 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 140 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |

Table 8 – Housing Problems 2

Data

Source: 2005-2009 CHAS

3. Cost Burden > 30%

| | Renter | | | | Owner | | | |
|----------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|-------|-----------|-------------|-------------|-------|
| | 0-30% AMI | >30-50% AMI | >50-80% AMI | Total | 0-30% AMI | >30-50% AMI | >50-80% AMI | Total |
| Small Related | 1,150 | 1,254 | 553 | 2,957 | 160 | 345 | 560 | 1,065 |
| Large Related | 510 | 155 | 80 | 745 | 75 | 200 | 265 | 540 |
| Elderly | 620 | 325 | 40 | 985 | 253 | 250 | 270 | 773 |
| Other | 1,280 | 695 | 335 | 2,310 | 190 | 125 | 330 | 645 |
| Total need by income | 3,560 | 2,429 | 1,008 | 6,997 | 678 | 920 | 1,425 | 3,023 |

Table 9 – Cost Burden > 30%

Data

Source: 2005-2009 CHAS

4. Cost Burden > 50%

| | Renter | | | | Owner | | | |
|----------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|-------|-----------|-------------|-------------|-------|
| | 0-30% AMI | >30-50% AMI | >50-80% AMI | Total | 0-30% AMI | >30-50% AMI | >50-80% AMI | Total |
| Small Related | 965 | 160 | 20 | 1,145 | 115 | 290 | 215 | 620 |
| Large Related | 370 | 30 | 0 | 400 | 75 | 100 | 75 | 250 |
| Elderly | 420 | 50 | 15 | 485 | 198 | 135 | 145 | 478 |
| Other | 1,075 | 30 | 20 | 1,125 | 180 | 100 | 135 | 415 |
| Total need by income | 2,830 | 270 | 55 | 3,155 | 568 | 625 | 570 | 1,763 |

Table 10 – Cost Burden > 50%

Data

Source: 2005-2009 CHAS

5. Crowding (More than one person per room)

| | Renter | | | | | Owner | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------|-----------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------|
| | 0-30% AMI | >30-50% AMI | >50-80% AMI | >80-100% AMI | Total | 0-30% AMI | >30-50% AMI | >50-80% AMI | >80-100% AMI | Total |
| Single family households | 445 | 344 | 240 | 0 | 1,029 | 0 | 45 | 39 | 0 | 84 |
| Multiple, unrelated family households | 45 | 35 | 20 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 15 | 40 | 0 | 55 |
| Other, non-family households | 25 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total need by income | 515 | 379 | 290 | 0 | 1,184 | 0 | 60 | 79 | 0 | 139 |

Table 11 – Crowding Information

Data

Source: 2005-2009 CHAS

What are the most common housing problems?

- Of the total households in Kent, 25% of renter households have housing problems and 20% of owner households have problems
- A total of 34% of all renter households and 32% of homeowners had one or more problems.
- 51% of renter households between 0-30% AMI pay more than 30% of their income toward housing costs
- 47% of the owner households between 50-80% AMI pay more than 30% of their income toward housing costs
- 43 % of renter households between 0-30% AMI experience crowding
- 57% of owner households between 50-80% of AMI experience crowding

Are any populations/household types more affected than others by these problems?

- 87% of single family renter households experience crowding
- 60% of single family owner households experience crowding
- 42% of small related renter households pay more than 30% of their income toward housing costs
- 35% of small related owner households pay more than 30% of their income toward housing costs

Describe the characteristics and needs of Low-income individuals and families with children (especially extremely low-income) who are currently housed but are at imminent risk of either residing in shelters or becoming unsheltered 91.205(c)/91.305(c)). Also discuss the needs of formerly homeless families and individuals who are receiving rapid re-housing assistance and are nearing the termination of that assistance

Low-income individuals and families with children who are currently housed are at risk of homelessness due to income, the rising costs of basics such as food, utilities, medical care and transportation. The economic recession of the past several years and the current high unemployment rate impact those at the lowest income levels more significantly than others. Minimum wage jobs that are often part-time do not have health care benefits, sick leave or other benefits such as retirement plans. The housing cost burden is generally highest for this segment of the population. Low cost or subsidized housing availability is limited and there is a wait list. Access to utility assistance programs is available only one time per year. Employment training that will provide opportunities for higher wage jobs is needed as are more jobs in sectors such as manufacturing and warehouses in order for families and individuals to stabilize their living situation.

If a jurisdiction provides estimates of the at-risk population(s), it should also include a description of the operational definition of the at-risk group and the methodology used to generate the estimates:

N/A

Specify particular housing characteristics that have been linked with instability and an increased risk of homelessness

- Overcrowding
- Cost Burden in excess of 30%
- Substandard housing

Discussion

Disproportionately, a higher percentage of low income households have unmet, unstable or poor living conditions than the population at large. The percentage is even higher among racial and ethnic minorities.

NA-15 Disproportionately Greater Need: Housing Problems

Assess the need of any racial or ethnic group that has disproportionately greater need in comparison to the needs of that category of need as a whole.

Introduction

A “disproportionately greater need” exists when low income members of a racial or ethnic group experience housing problems at a greater rate (10% of more) than the income level as a whole. For example, some African and Hispanic populations have large families, but may not have the income to secure three to four bedroom-housing. In addition, affordable housing stock with several bedrooms is limited further exacerbating the challenge.

Assess the need of any racial or ethnic group that has disproportionately greater need in comparison to the needs of that category of need as a whole.

0%-30% of Area Median Income

| Housing Problems | Has one or more of four housing problems | Has none of the four housing problems | Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems |
|--------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| Jurisdiction as a whole | 4,380 | 600 | 155 |
| White | 2,190 | 395 | 79 |
| Black / African American | 875 | 70 | 15 |
| Asian | 290 | 10 | 25 |
| American Indian, Alaska Native | 15 | 0 | 0 |
| Pacific Islander | 70 | 0 | 0 |
| Hispanic | 880 | 100 | 25 |

Table 12 - Disproportionally Greater Need 0 - 30% AMI

Data Source: 2005-2009 CHAS

*The four housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than one person per room, 4. Cost Burden greater than 30%

30%-50% of Area Median Income

| Housing Problems | Has one or more of four housing problems | Has none of the four housing problems | Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems |
|--------------------------------|---|--|---|
| Jurisdiction as a whole | 3,500 | 1,170 | 0 |
| White | 1,720 | 855 | 0 |
| Black / African American | 365 | 100 | 0 |
| Asian | 490 | 64 | 0 |
| American Indian, Alaska Native | 40 | 0 | 0 |
| Pacific Islander | 55 | 0 | 0 |
| Hispanic | 540 | 120 | 0 |

Table 13 - Disproportionally Greater Need 30 - 50% AMI

Data Source: 2005-2009 CHAS

*The four housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than one person per room, 4. Cost Burden greater than 30%

50%-80% of Area Median Income

| Housing Problems | Has one or more of four housing problems | Has none of the four housing problems | Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems |
|--------------------------------|---|--|---|
| Jurisdiction as a whole | 2,800 | 3,435 | 0 |
| White | 1,500 | 2,195 | 0 |
| Black / African American | 320 | 320 | 0 |
| Asian | 445 | 275 | 0 |
| American Indian, Alaska Native | 0 | 60 | 0 |
| Pacific Islander | 30 | 0 | 0 |
| Hispanic | 415 | 485 | 0 |

Table 14 - Disproportionally Greater Need 50 - 80% AMI

Data Source: 2005-2009 CHAS

*The four housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than one person per room, 4. Cost Burden greater than 30%

80%-100% of Area Median Income

| Housing Problems | Has one or more of four housing problems | Has none of the four housing problems | Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems |
|--------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| Jurisdiction as a whole | 1,050 | 2,290 | 0 |
| White | 675 | 1,605 | 0 |
| Black / African American | 65 | 155 | 0 |
| Asian | 135 | 255 | 0 |
| American Indian, Alaska Native | 0 | 45 | 0 |
| Pacific Islander | 40 | 10 | 0 |
| Hispanic | 100 | 175 | 0 |

Table 15 - Disproportionally Greater Need 80 - 100% AMI

Data Source: 2005-2009 CHAS

*The four housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than one person per room, 4. Cost Burden greater than 30%

Discussion

The following points are noteworthy in summarizing data presented at the four income levels for the major racial/ethnic groups residing in the City of Kent:

- While 14% of the jurisdiction as a whole in the 0-30% AMI category has a disproportionately greater housing need, 49% of the racial/ethnic population has a disproportionately greater housing need
- While 11% of the jurisdiction as a whole in the 30-50% AMI category has a disproportionately greater housing need, 43% of the racial/ethnic population has a disproportionately greater housing need
- While 9% of the jurisdiction as a whole in the 80-100% AMI category has a disproportionately greater housing need, 43% of the racial/ethnic population has a disproportionately greater housing need
- While 3% of the jurisdiction as a whole in the 80-100% AMI category has a disproportionately greater housing need, 32% of the racial/ethnic population has a disproportionately greater housing need

In summary, across all income categories, the racial/ethnic population within the City of Kent has a disproportionately greater housing need than the jurisdiction as a whole.

NA-20 Disproportionately Greater Need: Severe Housing Problems

Assess the need of any racial or ethnic group that has disproportionately greater need in comparison to the needs of that category of need as a whole.

Introduction

As stated previously, a “disproportionately greater need” exists when the members of a racial or ethnic group at an income level experience housing problems at a greater rate (10% or more) than the income level as a whole. The data tables below look at severe housing problems. Severe housing problems include homes that have one or more of the following disadvantages: (1) do not have complete kitchen facilities; (2) lack complete plumbing facilities; (3) household includes more than 1.5 persons per room; or (4) household pays more than 30% of its income for housing costs. These problems are indicators of poverty and disadvantage. For example, if a household does not have complete kitchen facilities, the family cannot cook a nutritious meal or may use an unsafe stove. Refugees who previously lived in refugee camps who lack plumbing facilities may put their lives at risk by using charcoal indoors.

Assess the need of any racial or ethnic group that has disproportionately greater need in comparison to the needs of that category of need as a whole.

0%-30% of Area Median Income

| Housing Problems | Has one or more of four housing problems | Has none of the four housing problems | Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems |
|--------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| Jurisdiction as a whole | 3,705 | 1,270 | 155 |
| White | 1,770 | 815 | 79 |
| Black / African American | 750 | 200 | 15 |
| Asian | 260 | 35 | 25 |
| American Indian, Alaska Native | 15 | 0 | 0 |
| Pacific Islander | 70 | 0 | 0 |
| Hispanic | 790 | 190 | 25 |

Table 16 – Severe Housing Problems 0 - 30% AMI

Data Source: 2005-2009 CHAS

*The four severe housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than 1.5 persons per room, 4. Cost Burden over 50%

30%-50% of Area Median Income

| Housing Problems | Has one or more of four housing problems | Has none of the four housing problems | Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems |
|--------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| Jurisdiction as a whole | 1,330 | 3,335 | 0 |
| White | 525 | 2,050 | 0 |
| Black / African American | 105 | 360 | 0 |
| Asian | 325 | 230 | 0 |
| American Indian, Alaska Native | 0 | 40 | 0 |
| Pacific Islander | 40 | 15 | 0 |
| Hispanic | 205 | 455 | 0 |

Table 17 – Severe Housing Problems 30 - 50% AMI

Data Source: 2005-2009 CHAS

*The four severe housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than 1.5 persons per room, 4. Cost Burden over 50%

50%-80% of Area Median Income

| Housing Problems | Has one or more of four housing problems | Has none of the four housing problems | Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems |
|--------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| Jurisdiction as a whole | 1,040 | 5,195 | 0 |
| White | 385 | 3,320 | 0 |
| Black / African American | 120 | 520 | 0 |
| Asian | 255 | 465 | 0 |
| American Indian, Alaska Native | 0 | 60 | 0 |
| Pacific Islander | 30 | 0 | 0 |
| Hispanic | 225 | 675 | 0 |

Table 18 – Severe Housing Problems 50 - 80% AMI

Data Source: 2005-2009 CHAS

*The four severe housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than 1.5 persons per room, 4. Cost Burden over 50%

80%-100% of Area Median Income

| Housing Problems | Has one or more of four housing problems | Has none of the four housing problems | Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems |
|--------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| Jurisdiction as a whole | 305 | 3,035 | 0 |
| White | 175 | 2,105 | 0 |
| Black / African American | 4 | 210 | 0 |
| Asian | 15 | 380 | 0 |
| American Indian, Alaska Native | 0 | 45 | 0 |
| Pacific Islander | 40 | 10 | 0 |
| Hispanic | 45 | 235 | 0 |

Table 19 – Severe Housing Problems 80 - 100% AMI

Data Source: 2005-2009 CHAS

*The four severe housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than 1.5 persons per room, 4. Cost Burden over 50%

Discussion

- While 12% of the jurisdiction as a whole in the 0-30% AMI category has a disproportionately greater severe housing need, 51% of the racial/ethnic population has a disproportionately greater housing need
- While 4% of the jurisdiction as a whole in the 30-50% AMI category has a disproportionately greater severe housing need, 51% of the racial/ethnic population has a disproportionately greater housing need
- While 3% of the jurisdiction as a whole in the 50-80% AMI category has a disproportionately greater severe housing need, 61% of the racial/ethnic population has a disproportionately greater housing need
- While 1% of the jurisdiction as a whole in the 80-100% AMI category has a disproportionately greater severe housing need, 34% of the racial/ethnic population has a disproportionately greater housing need

In summary, over half of the racial/ethnic population across all income categories except the highest AMI, has a disproportionately greater housing need than the jurisdiction as a whole.

NA-25 Disproportionately Greater Need: Housing Cost Burdens

Assess the need of any racial or ethnic group that has disproportionately greater need in comparison to the needs of that category of need as a whole.

Introduction

It is well established by affordable housing researchers that housing costs should not exceed 30% of annual household income.[1] Housing costs include rent or mortgage payment, utilities, insurance, and property taxes. A household has a housing cost burden if it pays more than 30 percent of its income on housing costs. When this occurs, families do not have enough income left over to pay for food, transportation, healthcare, education expenses, household maintenance, etc. This leads to the culture of “living from paycheck to paycheck” or living beyond economic means.

Assess the need of any racial or ethnic group that has disproportionately greater need in comparison to the needs of that category of need as a whole.

[1]Schwartz, Mary and Ellen Wilson. *Who Can Afford to Live in a Home: A look at Data from the 2006 American Community Survey*. U.S. Census Bureau.

Housing Cost Burden

| Housing Cost Burden | <=30% | 30-50% | >50% | No / negative income (not computed) |
|--------------------------------|--------|--------|-------|-------------------------------------|
| Jurisdiction as a whole | 19,550 | 7,110 | 5,205 | 165 |
| White | 13,585 | 4,155 | 2,435 | 84 |
| Black / African American | 1,490 | 750 | 885 | 15 |
| Asian | 1,765 | 825 | 745 | 25 |
| American Indian, Alaska Native | 160 | 95 | 15 | 0 |
| Pacific Islander | 130 | 50 | 95 | 0 |
| Hispanic | 1,945 | 880 | 875 | 25 |

Table 20 – Greater Need: Housing Cost Burdens AMI

Data Source: 2005-2009 CHAS

Discussion

- A significant percentage of the jurisdiction as a whole in the 0-30% AMI category (61%) pays more than 30% of its income for housing costs; therefore, this is a formidable problem for Kent residents
- While 22% of the jurisdiction as a whole in the 30-50% AMI category has a disproportionately greater severe housing need, 37% of the racial/ethnic population has a disproportionately greater cost burden
- While 16% of the jurisdiction as a whole with income greater than 50% AMI has a disproportionately greater cost burden, 50% of the racial/ethnic population has a disproportionately greater cost burden

In summary, a large percentage of Kent households are over extended on the amount they pay for housing costs. The weak economy, lack of livable wage jobs, reduced funding from the public sector, decreased resources and a growing low-income population lessens the probability of individuals and

families meeting their daily basic needs. The need to prioritize whether to pay for shelter, food or healthcare can lead to eviction, foreclosures and homelessness.

NA-30 Disproportionately Greater Need: Discussion

Income categories in which a racial or ethnic group has disproportionately greater need

When analyzing need between the jurisdiction as a whole and the racial/ethnic populations, the City chooses to view its racial/ethnic populations collectively rather than individually.

Income categories in which a racial or ethnic group has disproportionately greater need are as follows:

Housing Problems

- Racial/ethnic populations have a disproportionately greater need across all income categories

Severe Housing Problems

- Racial/ethnic populations have a disproportionately greater need across all income categories

Housing Cost Burdens

- Racial/ethnic populations have a disproportionately greater need in the 0-30%, 30-50%, and greater than 50% income categories

Needs not previously identified

It is noteworthy that 61% of Kent residents who receive 0-30% AMI pay more than 30% of their annual income toward housing costs. This means that family budgets are stretched to the limit and people are struggling to maintain housing. Living wage jobs are critical if this income group is to break out of the cycle of poverty and become less dependent on government subsidies.

Are any of those racial or ethnic groups located in specific areas or neighborhoods in your community?

A significant number of racial/ethnic groups are located on the East Hill, West Hill and Panther Lake areas of the City.

NA-35 Public Housing

Introduction

King County Housing Authority (KCHA) is responsible for public housing and Section 8 vouchers in most of King County, excluding Seattle and Renton which have their own local housing authorities. KCHA properties located in Kent include three large family project based complexes (Birch Creek, Cascade and Valli Kee), and a senior housing project (Harrison House). In total, KCHA manages almost 3,500 units of housing, including 546 public housing units in Kent. Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers are provided to another 1,321 low/moderate- income households in the City[1]. KCHA gives preference for housing to families with children, seniors or disabled persons.

The public housing units are in good condition. The latest KCHA physical condition surveys of three of the four individual properties reflect this. Each of the projects was rated in the range of 92-95 points in the HUD rating system (between 90-100 points fall within “standard 1” – the highest level in the rating system). Several have been upgraded. The fourth project, Birch Creek (formerly Springwood Apartments), recently received a major rehabilitation and upgrade. In the process, the number of public housing units decreased to 262 units (60 units were lost). Additional improvements are taking place at Valli Kee project which will result in a fully compliant Section 504 project with handicapped accessible units. In addition, the reconstruction will improve the community facility.

KCHA maintains a wait list for public housing units it manages. In 2010, the wait list included a total of 7,700 applicants. Applicants may indicate either their priority for one or two specific developments or for one or two regions containing public housing units. In 2012, there were 1,459 Kent households on the countywide application wait list. Of those, 732 indicated a preference for housing in the Southeast region of the County. A total of 5,145 households on the countywide wait list indicated that Southeast region housing developments were their first choice, and 1,372 indicated their preference as one or more of the public housing developments located in Kent. KCHA estimates that there is a 3-5 year wait for most of their units.

[1]KCHA data base for addresses of Section 8 Vouchers located in one of the three primary zip codes in the City (98030, 98031 and 98032).

Totals in Use

| | Program Type | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|-----------|----------------|--------|---------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|
| | Certificate | Mod-Rehab | Public Housing | Total | Project-based | Tenant-based | Special Purpose Voucher | | |
| | | | | | | | Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing | Family Unification Program | Disabled * |
| # of units vouchers in use | 0 | 0 | 2,412 | 10,133 | 979 | 9,153 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| *includes Non-Elderly Disabled, Mainstream One-Year, Mainstream Five_year, and Nursing Home Transition | | | | | | | | | |

Table 21 - Public Housing by Program Type

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Characteristics of Residents

| | Certificate | Mod-Rehab | Public Housing | Program Type | | | | | |
|---|-------------|-----------|----------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|
| | | | | Total | Project-based | Tenant-based | Special Purpose Voucher | | |
| | | | | | | | Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing | Family Unification Program | Disabled * |
| Average Annual Income | 0 | 0 | 15,093 | 13,010 | 12,859 | 13,026 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Average length of stay | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Average Household size | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # Homeless at admission | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # of Elderly Program Participants (>62) | 0 | 0 | 1,021 | 1,841 | 180 | 1,661 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # of Disabled Families | 0 | 0 | 648 | 3,531 | 176 | 3,354 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # of Families requesting accessibility features | 0 | 0 | 2,412 | 10,133 | 979 | 9,153 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # of HIV/AIDS program participants | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # of DV victims | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

*includes Non-Elderly Disabled, Mainstream One-Year, Mainstream Five_year, and Nursing Home Transition

Table 22 – Characteristics of Public Housing Residents by Program Type

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Race of Residents

| Race | Certificate | Mod-Rehab | Public Housing | Program Type | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-------------|-----------|----------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|
| | | | | Total | Project-based | Tenant-based | Special Purpose Voucher | | |
| | | | | | | | Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing | Family Unification Program | Disabled * |
| White | 0 | 0 | 1,485 | 5,222 | 535 | 4,687 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Black/African American | 0 | 0 | 531 | 3,866 | 251 | 3,614 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Asian | 0 | 0 | 337 | 629 | 161 | 468 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| American Indian/Alaska Native | 0 | 0 | 38 | 181 | 16 | 165 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pacific Islander | 0 | 0 | 21 | 222 | 16 | 206 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

*includes Non-Elderly Disabled, Mainstream One-Year, Mainstream Five_year, and Nursing Home Transition

Table 23 – Race of Public Housing Residents by Program Type

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Ethnicity of Residents

| Race | Certificate | Mod-Rehab | Public Housing | Program Type | | | | | |
|--------------|-------------|-----------|----------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|
| | | | | Total | Project-based | Tenant-based | Special Purpose Voucher | | |
| | | | | | | | Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing | Family Unification Program | Disabled * |
| Hispanic | 0 | 0 | 102 | 522 | 81 | 441 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Not Hispanic | 0 | 0 | 2,310 | 9,598 | 898 | 8,699 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

*includes Non-Elderly Disabled, Mainstream One-Year, Mainstream Five_year, and Nursing Home Transition

Table 24 – Ethnicity of Public Housing Residents by Program Type

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Section 504 Needs Assessment

Needs of public housing tenants and applicants on the waiting list for accessible units

[To be added]

Most immediate needs of residents of Public Housing and Housing Choice voucher holders

A total of 1,459 Kent residents are currently on the King County Housing waiting list. A total of 7,700 applicants in King County were on the waiting list in 2010. KCHA estimates that there is a 3-5 year wait for most of their units.

KCHA also manages the HUD Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program that provide scattered site rental assistance to qualified low/moderate-income households. The tenant pays 30% of their income for housing costs and the federal subsidy pays the landlord the balance of the rental cost up to the established Fair Market Rents. There are currently a total of 1,321 households in Kent being assisted with vouchers. Thirty-seven percent of the vouchers in Kent are occupied by households with a disabled person, 17% are elderly and another 9% include a person who is both elderly and disabled. One-third of households with vouchers are single (of all ages) and 18% are being used for large households (households with five or more persons).

Last year, KCHA opened the Section 8 Voucher Program for new applications. Approximately 24,000 households applied for housing, 1,969 were from households with Kent addresses. Of these applicants, 34% were from households with elderly and/or disabled persons and 15% were households containing five or more persons. The process closed in June 2011, at which time KCHA randomly selected 2,500 applications to be placed on an active wait list. Two hundred-eighty Kent applicants were selected for this short list.

The immediate needs of residents of public housing and Section 8 tenant-based rental assistance include:

- Childcare assistance
- Job readiness training and employment assistance
- Living wage jobs
- ESL classes
- After-school programs
- Homework assistance
- Utility assistance
- Micro-enterprise assistance

How do these needs compare to the housing needs of the population at large

The population at large, especially those who make 30-80% of AMI, has similar needs.

NA-40 Homeless Needs Assessment

Introduction

The projection of how many people are experiencing homelessness each year and/or becoming homeless in the coming year is not available. The most recent turn away rate for families requesting shelter is 14:1. The local school district and DSHS reports an increasing number of families self-reporting as homeless. The point in time count is conducted in January as required by HUD yet this is the time of year when it is less likely to find homeless on the streets as they find places to take shelter out of the elements. The shelter they find is not always in facilities participating in the count. Most mainstream shelters that participate in the count are filled to capacity on a consistent basis.

Availability of beds at family shelters in Kent or South King County is very limited. Homeless families in South King County often refuse to go to Seattle for shelter. Many families couch surf or sleep in their cars.

Homeless Needs Assessment

| Population | Estimate the # of persons experiencing homelessness on a given night | | Estimate the # experiencing homelessness each year | Estimate the # becoming homeless each year | Estimate the # exiting homelessness each year | Estimate the # of days persons experience homelessness |
|--|--|-------------|--|--|---|--|
| | Sheltered | Unsheltered | | | | |
| Persons in Households with Adult(s) and Child(ren) | 213 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Persons in Households with Only Children | 829 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Persons in Households with Only Adults | 2,761 | 2,594 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Chronically Homeless Individuals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Chronically Homeless Families | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Veterans | 397 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Unaccompanied Child | 29 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Persons with HIV | 144 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table 25 - Homeless Needs Assessment

Data Source
Comments:

Population includes Rural none
Homeless:

Jurisdiction's Rural Homeless Population

For persons in rural areas who are homeless or at risk of homelessness, describe the nature and extent of unsheltered and sheltered homelessness with the jurisdiction

If data is not available for the categories "number of persons becoming and exiting homelessness each year," and "number of days that persons experience homelessness," describe these categories for each homeless population type (including chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth):

Nature and Extent of Homelessness by Racial and Ethnic Group

This data is unavailable. There is data submitted by Safe Harbors in their Annual Homeless Assessment Report that looks at the percentage of homeless by racial and ethnic group in shelters, transitional housing and permanent supportive housing. While that provides a snapshot of the demographics it does not account for street homeless those using shelters not participating in HMIS or couch surfing.

Nature and Extent of Unsheltered and Sheltered Homelessness, including Rural Homelessness

It is estimated that 3,000 adult-only households are sheltered in King County on any given night and that 2,594 adult-only households are unsheltered. Sufficient data for Kent is unavailable-shelters are located throughout King County and families and individuals could be staying in any of them. Kent is not considered a rural area.

Discussion

NA-45 Non-Homeless Special Needs Assessment

Introduction

Housing and Supportive Service Needs and Determination

This section will discuss the following special needs populations:

- Elderly
- Frail elderly
- Refugees and Immigrants (new racial/ethnic populations)
- Persons with mental, physical and/or developmental disabilities
- Persons with substance abuse addiction
- Persons with HIV/AIDS and their families
- Victims of interpersonal family violence

The discussion will include the housing needs of these populations. Special needs populations are often at risk of homelessness due to limited income, lack of supportive services, isolation, vulnerability to financial scams, language barriers, limited linguistically/culturally responsive services and resources, etc.

[1]DeNavas-Walt, C., B. Proctor, and J. Smith. U.S. Census Bureau. *Current Population Reports, P60-239, Income, Poverty, and Health Insurance Coverage in the United States: 2010*. Washington: Government Printing Office, 2011.

Characteristics of Special Needs Populations

Seniors and Frail Elderly - According to the 2010 Census 8,131 (9%) of Kent residents are over 65 years old and 1,108 (1%) of the population was 85 years or older. Mosby's Medical Dictionary defines frail elderly as "older persons (usually above 85 years of age) who have multiple physical or mental disabilities that may interfere with the ability to perform activities of daily independent living." The frail elderly generally are unable to function independently without the assistance of caregivers. As elderly persons begin to lose their mobility, become more dependent on family and the community, and become increasingly isolated as they lose their social network, the need for assistance grows.

Disabilities - Persons with disabilities are at a disadvantage to live productive, safe and healthy lives due to a scarcity of health care, accessible facilities, affordable housing and supportive services. When disability and poverty confront a family or individual, their ability to cope is severely compromised. One of the major issues facing disabled persons is the inability to compete for living wage jobs.

Mental Illness - Mental illness includes a range of individual coping issues which not only affect the individual but also significantly impact the family and community support systems. Untreated mental illness affects the community care system and can lead to hospitalizations, incarceration, and homelessness. It also affects family members and is a major risk factor for children living with a family member with mental illness.

The 2011 King County Mental Health Quarterly Report Card indicated that 35,339 individuals in the County received outpatient services in 2011, up 7% from 2009. One-third of King County's adult non-institutionalized population had a diagnosable mental condition or an episode with substance abuse each year. The National Alliance on Mental Illness states that almost 10% of the South King population

has a mental disorder which is serious enough to interfere with normal living activities. A recent report by the Surgeon General stated that up to one in five children has a diagnosable mental illness, and 5% to 9% have a mental illness which causes "severe functional impairment."

Developmental Disabilities - The 2010-2013 King County Plan for Developmental Disabilities reports that 4,008 persons in South King County were enrolled in the County Developmental Disabilities Program as of December 31, 2009. Persons with developmental disabilities require support systems so that they can operate with maximum independence within the restrictions of their disability.

Substance Abuse - Persons with mental illness often have co-occurring illnesses, with chronic substance abuse being the most common as many choose to "self-medicate" to ease their mental issues. The countywide waiting list for obtaining a common drug-addiction treatment (methadone) has grown from 59 people in 2009 to 500 in June 2011.

Domestic Violence - Domestic violence is the pattern of intentional, abusive behavior that one person in an intimate relationship uses over another to gain power or control. One in every four women is likely to experience domestic violence in her lifetime. However, studies have estimated that 38% of victims never report abuse to anyone and only 15% of those abused report it to law enforcement. For this reason, the extent of domestic violence is considered highly understated.

Housing and Supportive Service Needs and Determination

Seniors and Frail Elderly

Housing costs can be a major hurdle for the elderly, and particularly those with limited assets. A cost of \$4,000 to \$5,000 per month for a retirement apartment with meal service is considered the norm. As reported in the Housing Needs section, Kent has several senior housing developments which provide housing at affordable rents. However, as the number of seniors grows, additional housing and services will be required.

The housing industry has been changing in response to the evolving needs of this population. As the need for added care grows (e.g., assisted living services, etc.), senior care agencies are rapidly adding to the inventory of facilities with more intensive services. Retirement homes that already exist are simply adding incremental "assisted living" services in-place as necessary so that aging seniors may remain in their homes. Frail seniors may require nursing care.

Each change in level of service generally means increased costs to the seniors. As a result of the recent recession and its impact on the investments of retired individuals, many retired individuals and couples watched their savings disappear, requiring them to seek more services from government sources to meet their needs.

The following five goals have been established in the Seattle-King County *Area Plan on Aging*:^[1]

- Improve health care quality for older adults and adults with disabilities
- Address basic needs
- Improve health and well being
- Increase independence for frail older persons and adults with disabilities
- Promote aging readiness

Persons with Disabilities and Special Needs

In general, major needs of persons with disabilities and Special Needs include living wage jobs, job readiness programs, affordable housing, sufficient health care, and adequate transportation.

[1] Aging and Disabilities Services (ADS). (2011). *Area Plan on Aging – Seattle/King County Washington 2012-2015 (draft)*.

Public Size and Characteristics of Population with HIV / AIDS

There were 6,852 persons living in King County in 2011 who reported living with HIV/AIDS. Persons with HIV/AIDS require more intensive services as their disease progresses.[1]There are a number of HIV/AIDS programs in King County to which agencies in Kent refer persons in need of assistance. These include the Seattle-King County Public Health Department, HIV/AIDS Programs, and the DSHS Community Service Office in Kent. The Teen Clinics in Renton and Auburn offer STD and HIV testing for teens and are accessible by bus.

Public Size and Characteristics of Population with HIV/AIDS

The most recent data regarding People Living with HIV or AIDS (PLWHA) is current through December 31, 2011. Data indicate[1]:

- 11,216 PLWHA reside in Washington State, with 6,935 residing in King County
- 90% of PLWHA in King County are males; men having sex with men (MSM) make up 77%
- 10% of PLWA in King County were exposed to HIV through heterosexual contact
- 16% of PLWA in King County were foreign-born
- 41% in King County were diagnosed with HIV between 30-39 years old
- 39% of PLWA in King County were 40-49 years old

[1]Washington State/Seattle-King County HIV/AIDS Epidemiology Report, Public Health Seattle & King County, Washington State Department of Health, December 2011, 79th Edition.

[1]Seattle-King County Public Health. (August 2011). *HIV/AIDS Surveillance Report*.

Discussion

People with special needs are increasing in the City of Kent as baby boomers age into seniors; a growing number of refugees are settled in the area or come to Kent as secondary migrants; economic stressors push people into homelessness and substance abuse; and resources dry up for people to turn for assistance when they experience interpersonal violence. The City continues to look for creative ways to join with its partners to respond to people with special needs.

NA-50 Non-Housing Community Development Needs

Public Facilities

The City of Kent has several key public facilities, owned by nonprofit organizations, that are located within the city. These include, but are not necessarily limited to, the following:

- Alliance Center
- Catholic Community Services
- Domestic Abuse Women's Network (DAWN)
- Dynamic Partners
- HealthPoint
- Kent Youth and Family Services-Administrative Facility and Watson Manor Transitional Housing
- King County Housing Authority Buildings
- Mercy Housing
- Pediatric Interim Care Center
- YWCA-Anita Vista Transitional Housing

The City may use CDBG capital funds for public facility improvements and infrastructure updates. This will be determined on a case-by-case basis.

The City needs additional space in neighborhoods to provide recreational and afterschool activities to improve accessibility to low income families and individuals. The City is currently working to improve connectivity in neighborhoods so residents can bike or walk to schools and parks.

The City of Kent and South King County need a facility to co-house human services organizations that serve ethnic/racial populations or new residents. New residents are broadly defined as anyone born outside of the United States who moved to the United States as a refugee or immigrant and speaks English as a Second Language, is learning to speak ESL, or is non-English Proficient.

Need Determination

The City of Kent's Parks and Open Space Plan adopted in 2010 used public input, demographic data and usage data to set the goals and policies.

The need for an ethnic based facility was determined through the Preserving and Strengthening Ethnic-Based Community Organizations Capacity Assessment interviews, discussions between human services staff and community leaders, meetings between the Mayor's Office and community leaders, and feedback from Kent Cultural Diversity Initiative Group participants. The City is interested in participating in determining a response to this need.

Public Improvements

The City does not anticipate using CDBG funds for public improvements; public improvement needs are supported by other City funds.

Need Determination

Public Services

The City of Kent has been impacted by the poor economy of the last several years. Agencies providing public services in the city have had funding cuts at all levels including federal, state and county. Additionally the sharp increase in the number of residents living in poverty or with low and moderate incomes has increased the demand for services particularly those addressing basic needs. The City anticipates using the full 15% of its CDBG allocation to support public services programs over the five-year Consolidated Plan period.

Need Determination

The public services needs were determined using demographic information, needs assessments, unemployment rates, welfare case loads and public input. The determination to use up to the full federally allowed amount of CDBG funds for public services projects was determined in consultation with nonprofit organizations, stakeholders and community leaders. The City also arrived at this decision by considering comments received through the Citizen Participation Survey, at the public hearing, and other written comments.

Housing Market Analysis

MA-05 Overview

Housing Market Analysis Overview:

Economy

Beginning in August 2008, the King County unemployment rate was a modest 4.7% but the rate increased for seven consecutive months as the recession took hold. In spring 2009, it began to level off in the 8% range before drifting up and finally peaking at 9.6% in January 2010. Unemployment remained above 9% until December 2010.10 to 7.1% in 2011. Unemployment decreased from 8.6% in 2010 to 7.1% in 2011. According to Forecasechart.com, the unemployment rate is projected to be 8% in August 2013.

Rental Market

The average rent for a two-bedroom apartment in the Seattle-Bellevue area was \$1,176 in 2011 and \$1,098 in 2012. The apartment vacancy rate in King County was 4.1% in March 2012, down from 6.1% in 2010. If unemployment increases and incomes do not keep up with the cost of living, the demand on the rental market will continue to rise as people will not be able to affordable to purchase houses.

Home Values

A major impact of the recent recession has been the impact of falling home values on owners. Median prices for homes in Kent have fallen from a high of \$208,328 in early 2008 to as low as \$195,000 in February 2012 before making a modest rise to \$196,600 by April. However, between May 2011 and April 2012, home values decreased by 8.3%. The implication of these huge drops is that homes purchased with high leverage just a few years ago, now have values less than the mortgage debt and are ripe for foreclosure. In February 2012, 33% of King County homeowners owed mortgages greater than the value of their home. In Kent, the “negative equity” reached over 50% of homeowners, according to the Zillow Real Estate Analysis: Negative Equity Repprt-Second Quarter 2012.

The Housing Market Analysis will cover the following points:

- Significant characteristics of the City’s housing market in general, including the supply, demand, and condition and cost of housing;
- Housing stock available to serve persons with disabilities and other special needs;
- Condition and needs of public and assisted housing;
- Brief inventory of facilities, housing, and services that meet the needs of homeless persons;
- Regulatory barriers to affordable housing; and
- Significant characteristics of the City’s economy.

MA-10 Number of Housing Units

Introduction

As of the 2010 census, there were 36,424 housing units in Kent. Half were single family, the majority of which were detached single family. The share of units in large multifamily complexes fell to 30% and the percent of mobile homes in relation to total units in 2010 was half that in 2000.

Since data provided in this section relies on the 2010 census and the 2006-2010 American Community Survey for much of the discussion, it is important to note the significant change attributable to the Panther Lake Annexation, which occurred after the 2010 census. Over 9,000 housing units were added to Kent in that annexation. This raised the total units to 45,644 – 25% more than tallied by the 2010 census.

About half of all Kent households lived in housing they were buying or owned. This is low compared to King County (59% owner-occupied) and Washington State (64% owner-occupied). Tenure has undoubtedly been influenced in many ways by declining housing prices and foreclosures in the last few years. For example, a number of owners attempting unsuccessfully to sell their homes opted to rent them out temporarily.

Tenure varied by type of household, as is shown in Table 27. Fifty-seven percent of family households owned or were buying, compared with 39% of non-family households. Tenure also varied by the race and ethnicity of the householder. Just 30% of Hispanic householders lived in housing they owned or were buying. This compares to 35% in King County and 43% in the State of Washington.

All rental properties by number of units

| Property Type | Number | % |
|---------------------------------|---------------|-------------|
| 1-unit detached structure | 32,023 | 62% |
| 1-unit, attached structure | 2,196 | 4% |
| 2-4 units | 2,195 | 4% |
| 5-20 units | 9,118 | 18% |
| More than 20 units | 5,154 | 10% |
| Mobile Home, boat, RV, van, etc | 1,063 | 2% |
| Total | 51,749 | 100% |

Table 26 – Rental Properties by Unit Number

Data Source: 2005-2009 ACS Data

Unit Size by Tenure

| | Owners | | Renters | |
|--------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|
| | Number | % | Number | % |
| No bedroom | 36 | 0% | 456 | 3% |
| 1 bedroom | 338 | 2% | 4,877 | 31% |
| 2 bedrooms | 2,734 | 17% | 7,092 | 44% |
| 3 bedrooms | 12,962 | 81% | 3,528 | 22% |
| Total | 16,070 | 100% | 15,953 | 100% |

Table 27 – Unit Size by Tenure

Data Source: 2005-2009 ACS Data

Number and Targeting of Units

The City targets assistance to low/moderate-income owner-occupied homes by offering a variety of home repair services to single family homes, mobile homes and condominiums through its CDBG-funded Home Repair Program. Grants of up to \$5,000 are available for repairs aimed at helping to maintain the health and safety of occupants, preserve the dwelling and/or conserve energy by reducing heating costs through weatherization. Qualified mobile homes are limited to those which are 1976 or newer with HUD Certification, which have not been given prior repairs through the program and are occupied by a senior and/or disabled person. Priority is given to income-eligible seniors or householders with a disability. Although the majority of repairs on Kent homes are minor in nature, a small number of homes receive major repairs which can include roof replacement, heating, and electrical or plumbing improvements. A total of 318 households received home repair assistance from 2008-2011, and the City estimates that it will serve approximately 400 households over the next five years.

King County also provides grant and loan assistance to repair homes through its Home Repair Program (using HUD HOME funds) for low-income homeowners and renters. Loans of up to \$25,000 are available to pay for major home repairs. Grants range up to \$3,000 to homeowners for resolution of urgent or life-threatening problems and for up to \$5,000 for emergency repairs of mobile homes. Grants of up to \$5,000 are also available to renters to make units accessible.

In addition to the assistance provided through the Home Repair Program, the City provides Housing Stability Grants through its CDBG-Program. Grants are provided to prevent eviction, which can lead to homelessness. In addition to providing funds to a larger organization, the City also funds an ethnic-based community organization that specializes in providing linguistically and culturally responsive assistance to refugees and immigrants.

Finally, a broad range of housing affordable to low/moderate-income residents is available through the King County Housing Authority and nonprofit agencies. These developments, along with rental assistance vouchers were made possible by federal and state housing programs and local funding efforts. Almost 3,000 subsidized units of housing are provided to low/moderate-income residents through the King County Housing Authority and nonprofit agencies (546 units through conventional low rent public housing; 2,342 acquired with bond/tax credit financing through Washington State Housing Finance Commission (WSHFC) in partnership with KCHA; and 107 through project-based Section 8 and other Partnerships). The projects provide a range of unit sizes; although there is a limited supply of units with more than three bedrooms (only three projects offer a total of 71 units with more than 3 bedrooms). Over one-third offer housing to seniors and disabled persons.

Units Expected to be lost from Inventory

As the previous table describing “Subsidized Housing Resources in Kent” shows, other federal and state programs have generated subsidized housing units for families and individuals in Kent over the years. These developments containing 2,449 units are largely owned and/or operated by nonprofit organizations and agencies, including KCHA.

WSHFC has several programs that subsidize the construction or rehabilitation process to develop new affordable housing for seniors and families. The primary programs are the:

- Federal Low Income Tax Credit Program for owners and investors proposing low-and moderate-income affordable rental housing through new construction or rehabilitation
- Multi-family and Non-profit Housing Bond Program, which provides bond financing for the development of affordable low-and moderate-income rental housing

There is a great potential for loss of many of these projects (which were subsidized by HUD or the WSHFC) as a community resource providing housing affordable to low- and moderate-income households. Many are nearing the end of the term of their contract. At that time, the housing owner can choose to leave the program and convert to market rate housing, posing a major problem for the tenants. The HUD Preservation Program is designed to preserve the subsidy in those developments. While KCHA has acquired several projects in the County through the HUD program, none are in Kent. In fact, several Kent developments have lost their subsidies in recent years, including the 74-unit Summit Apartments, the 32-unit Benson Village, and in 2010, the 60 family units at James Street Crossing. One major acquisition/rehabilitation taking place will result in preserving low income subsidies, although it will result in the net loss of 14 units. The *Tri-Court Senior Apartments* proposal involves the acquisition of 393 units currently known as Park Court Apartments, Meeker Court Apartments and Green River Court Apartments. The units have had a history of high vacancies. When acquired and moderately rehabilitated, 370 affordable housing units will remain along with nine “common area” units. The community facility areas of the complexes will receive significant enhancements. Also in place will be a new financial arrangement extending the life of subsidies. A minor change will affect the Campus Court II project which will be removed from the public housing unit roles later this year and converted to Project-based Section 8 assistance.

Transit-oriented development along Pacific Highway should result in redevelopment of the corridor. Several properties currently zoned for mobile homes may be sold to developers. Several of these parks have substandard housing and one is only for recreational vehicles. The static economy has resulted in fewer homes being sold and an increase in reinvestment in owner-occupied properties, thereby stabilizing the housing market.

Does the availability of housing units meet the needs of the population?

Although the current availability of housing units meets the needs of the Kent population, this will change over time due to an increase in population and demographic changes, especially an anticipated increase in the number of seniors. However, based on the poverty rate and the percentage of households with housing problems, Kent residents need additional affordable units.

Need for Specific Types of Housing

As stated previously, the City needs affordable housing. (*Affordable housing* is defined by the City Comprehensive Plan as “adequate, appropriate shelter, costing no more, with utilities, than 30% of the household’s gross monthly income.”) More specifically, what is needed is:

- Preservation of affordable housing
- Expansion of subsidized rental vouchers
- Additional special needs housing located in Kent to serve existing residents’ needs
- Additional affordable senior housing, including housing with assisted living services, to meet the needs of a rapidly growing population of persons over 65 years old
- Construction or acquisition of a limited number of subsidized units for large families

Discussion

MA-15 Cost of Housing

Introduction

Kent remains attractive to people looking for affordable housing in King County. The median value that Kent owner-occupants assigned to their units in the American Community Survey (2006-2010) was \$303,100, which was 74% of the median for King County. The value was just slightly (6%) higher than the median value assigned by owner-occupants in Washington State. Selected owner costs shown in Table 12 include mortgage, tax, insurance, condo fees and utilities. Gross rent includes utilities, whether paid by the tenant or by the landlord.

Cost of Housing

| | Based Year: 2000 | Most Recent Year: 2009 | % Change |
|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|----------|
| Median Home Value | 168,100 | 295,800 | 76% |
| Median Contract Rent | 655 | 787 | 20% |

Table 28 – Cost of Housing

Data Source: 2005-2009 ACS Data

| Rent Paid | Number | % |
|-----------------|---------------|---------------|
| Less than \$500 | 2,194 | 13.8% |
| \$500-999 | 10,712 | 67.2% |
| \$1,000-1,499 | 2,651 | 16.6% |
| \$1,500-1,999 | 247 | 1.6% |
| \$2,000 or more | 149 | 0.9% |
| Total | 15,953 | 100.0% |

Table 29 - Rent Paid

Data Source: 2005-2009 ACS Data

Housing Affordability

| % Units affordable to Households earning | Renter | Owner |
|--|----------|----------|
| 30% HAMFI | No Data | No Data |
| 50% HAMFI | No Data | No Data |
| 80% HAMFI | No Data | No Data |
| 100% HAMFI | No Data | No Data |
| Total | 0 | 0 |

Table 30 – Housing Affordability

Data Source Comments:

Monthly Rent

| Monthly Rent (\$) | Efficiency (no bedroom) | 1 Bedroom | 2 Bedroom | 3 Bedroom | 4 Bedroom |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Fair Market Rent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| High HOME Rent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Low HOME Rent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table 31 – Monthly Rent

Data Source Comments:

Availability of Sufficient Housing

The availability of affordable housing is insufficient. Obviously, this presents a greater impact on lower-income households. For example, a four-person household earning 30% of AMI (or \$2,200 a month) would need at least a two-bedroom apartment. That household could “afford” \$660 a month for rent and utilities. Yet, HUD estimates that fair market rent is \$1,098. Finding suitable units, appropriately priced and located is a challenge for most households. For lower-income households, the task is much more difficult and the likelihood of success more remote.

Expected Change of Housing Affordability

Average rents have not fluctuated as dramatically as home prices, although rent actually decreased in 2012. The difficult single family housing market and stagnated construction of new units (both single family and multifamily) are among the factors in maintaining rent levels.

According to the survey, Washington Center for Real Estate Research, Apartment Market Survey, the apartment vacancy rate in March 2012 in King County was 4.1%, down from 6.0% in 2010. Washington State also had a lower vacancy rate in 2012 (4.5%) than in 2010 (6.1%). The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) establishes income limits, fair market rents and utility allowances which are used to determine eligibility for programs and subsidy levels. These are adjusted annually based on an analysis of current income and costs by region.

If the economy continues to decline, housing, especially rental housing, will become less affordable. Home ownership will be more difficult due to unemployment, underemployment, and employers choosing not to provide cost of living increases to workers. This could lead to more demand for rental housing than the market can supply, thereby causing an increase in rental costs.

Rent Comparison

CDBG funds can not be used to produce housing. Preservation or rehabilitation activities are limited to the City's minor home repair program.

Discussion

MA-20 Condition of Housing

Introduction

Housing in Kent is relatively new. The 2006-2010 American Community Survey estimated that 60% of units in Kent were built after 1979 and just 3% were built before 1940. In comparison, 42% of units in King County were built after 1979 and 13% were built before 1940. Age of housing is often an indication of condition, especially where older homes and apartments have not been adequately maintained. An effective strategy for preserving older units is to provide timely maintenance. The City invests in this service through its Home Repair Program.

Definitions

The City adopted the 1997 Uniform Housing Code and defines “standard” and “substandard housing” as: “Standard housing” is any housing that complies with the 1997 Uniform Housing Code.

“Substandard housing” is: *Any unit, guest room or suite of rooms, or the premises on which the same is located, in which there exists any of the conditions (defined in detail in the UHC) that endanger the life, limb, health, property, safety or welfare of the public or the occupants shall be deemed to be substandard.*

Condition of Units

| Condition of Units | Owner-Occupied | | Renter-Occupied | |
|--------------------------------|----------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|
| | Number | % | Number | % |
| With one selected Condition | 5,194 | 32% | 7,064 | 44% |
| With two selected Conditions | 139 | 1% | 809 | 5% |
| With three selected Conditions | 17 | 0% | 8 | 0% |
| With four selected Conditions | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| No selected Conditions | 10,720 | 67% | 8,072 | 51% |
| Total | 16,070 | 100% | 15,953 | 100% |

Table 32 - Condition of Units

Data Source: 2005-2009 ACS Data

Year Unit Built

| Year Unit Built | Owner-Occupied | | Renter-Occupied | |
|-----------------|----------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|
| | Number | % | Number | % |
| 2000 or later | 2,273 | 14% | 1,023 | 6% |
| 1980-1999 | 7,319 | 46% | 8,706 | 55% |
| 1950-1979 | 5,580 | 35% | 5,435 | 34% |
| Before 1950 | 898 | 6% | 789 | 5% |
| Total | 16,070 | 101% | 15,953 | 100% |

Table 33 – Year Unit Built

Data Source: 2005-2009 CHAS

Risk of Lead-Based Paint Hazard

| Risk of Lead-Based Paint Hazard | Owner-Occupied | | Renter-Occupied | |
|---|----------------|-----|-----------------|-----|
| | Number | % | Number | % |
| Total Number of Units Built Before 1980 | 6,478 | 40% | 6,224 | 39% |
| Housing Units build before 1980 with children present | 2,234 | 14% | 814 | |

Table 34 – Risk of Lead-Based Paint

Data Source: 2005-2009 CHAS

Vacant Units

| | Suitable for Rehabilitation | Not Suitable for Rehabilitation | Total |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|-------|
| Vacant Units | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Abandoned Vacant Units | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| REO Properties | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Abandoned REO Properties | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table 35 - Vacant Units

Data Source Comments:

Need for Owner and Rental Rehabilitation

Over half (60%) of Kent homes were built after 1979; therefore, Kent homes are relatively new and in good to fair condition. Low/moderate-income homeowners may apply to the Home Repair Program for home repair assistance.

Estimated Number of Housing Units Occupied by Low or Moderate Income Families with LBP Hazards

The baseline used for the number of units that contain lead-based paint hazards is the number of units built before 1980 that are occupied by households with children. According to the data, 14% of Kent households fall within this category. It is estimated that 2,244 of Kent housing units are occupied by low/moderate-income families with LBP hazards.

Discussion

MA-25 Public and Assisted Housing

Introduction

This section is addressed in King County Housing Authority's *Move to Work Annual Plan* for FY2012, which is attached. In addition, the City's Consolidated Plan responds to the needs of public housing residents. As stated previously, needs include the following:

- Childcare assistance
- Job search and training
- Living wage jobs
- ESL classes
- After-school programs
- Homework assistance
- Utility assistance
- Micro-enterprise assistance

The City continues to prioritize funding to programs that build a healthy community by providing childcare assistance, employment assistance, utility and emergency assistance, and micro-enterprise assistance

KCHA encourages resident participation and feedback through its Resident Advisory Committee. The purpose of the Resident Advisory Committee is to create a forum for resident feedback to assist the Housing Authority in its development of policies and procedures that affect residents. In doing this, the Committee also acts as the voice of the resident community and works to ensure a high quality of living throughout all of King County Housing Authority's affordable housing.

Totals Number of Units

| | Program Type | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|-----------|----------------|----------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|
| | Certificate | Mod-Rehab | Public Housing | Vouchers | | | | | |
| | | | | Total | Project - based | Tenant - based | Special Purpose Voucher | | |
| | | | | | | | Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing | Family Unification Program | Disabled * |
| # of units vouchers available | 0 | 0 | 2,966 | 7,659 | 883 | 6,776 | 1,127 | 0 | 5,100 |
| # of accessible units | | | | | | | | | |
| # of FSS participants | | | | | | | | | |
| # of FSS completions | | | | | | | | | |
| *includes Non-Elderly Disabled, Mainstream One-Year, Mainstream Five_year, and Nursing Home Transition | | | | | | | | | |

Table 36 – Total Number of Units by Program Type

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Supply of Public Housing Development

The latest KCHA physical condition surveys of three of the four individual properties located in Kent rated in the range of 92-95 points in the HUD rating system (between 90-100 points falls within “standard 1, which is the highest level in the rating system).

Public Housing Condition

| Public Housing Development | Average Inspection Score |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| | |

Table 37 - Public Housing Condition

Restoration and Revitalization Needs

See Move to Work Annual Plan.

Strategy of Improving the Living Environment of low- and moderate Income Families

Several KCHA Public Developments have been upgraded. Birch Creek (formerly Springwood Apartments), recently received a major rehabilitation and upgrade. In the process, the number of public housing units dropped to 262 units. Additional improvements are taking place in the Valli Kee project which will result in fully compliant Section 504 project with handicapped accessible units. In addition, the reconstruction will improve the community facility.

Additional information is included in the Move to Work Annual Plan, which is attached.

Discussion

MA-30 Homeless Facilities

Introduction

The City of Kent hosts several facilities for homeless men, women and families (emergency shelters, transitional housing, permanent supportive housing and DV shelters/transitional housing). Additionally, the City supports a severe weather shelter during the winter that opens when outdoor temperatures pose a health hazard and is available to anyone in need.

Facilities Targeted to Homeless Persons

| | Emergency Shelter Beds | | Transitional Housing Beds | Permanent Supportive Housing Beds | |
|---|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| | Year Round Beds (Current & New) | Voucher / Seasonal / Overflow Beds | Current & New | Current & New | Under Development |
| Households with Adult(s) and Child(ren) | 39 | 0 | 146 | 0 | 0 |
| Unaccompanied Youth | 30 | 50 | 35 | 45 | 0 |
| Households with Only Adults | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Chronically Homeless Households | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Veterans | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table 38 - Facilities Targeted to Homeless Persons

Data Source

Comments:

Describe mainstream services, such as health, mental health, and employment services to the extent those services are used to complement services targeted to homeless persons

The following mainstream services are available to homeless persons in the Kent community.

- Kent Youth and Family Services has transitional housing for homeless parenting teenage girls (Watson Manor) and mental health and substance abuse counseling for youth and families.
- Mercy Housing provides case management services to homeless people
- Kent Food Bank provides food and emergency assistance
- King County Bar Association provides legal services
- Multi Service Center the local community action program provides emergency shelter, transitional housing, rent/move-in assistance and homeless prevention services
- YWCA provides transitional housing for domestic violence survivors and their children (Anita Vista)
- King County Veterans Information and Assistance Line provides information and referrals to veterans and their families to connect them to benefits and services
- King County Veterans Program provides employment, financial assistance, and emergency shelter
- King County Housing Stability Project provides resources to help vulnerable and at-risk veterans maintain permanent housing
- KCHA Housing Access and Services Program (HASP) provides housing to low-income permanently disabled individuals, including veterans

List and describe services and facilities that meet the needs of homeless persons, particularly chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth. If the services and facilities are listed on screen SP-40 Institutional Delivery Structure or screen MA-35 Special Needs Facilities and Services, describe how these facilities and services specifically address the needs of these populations.

Agencies providing services specifically for homeless persons include

- Catholic Community Services provides transitional housing and the HOME Shelter provides case management and emergency assistance services for men
- HealthPoint Healthcare for the Homeless provides nursing services
- DAWN has a domestic violence shelter for homeless women and their children with case management and safety planning
- South King County Mobile Medical Van provides medical, dental and mental health care for the homeless at a variety of sites such as community suppers

MA-35 Special Needs Facilities and Services

Introduction

Persons that are not homeless also require supportive housing and programs to ensure that when released from mental and physical facilities they receive appropriate supportive housing to prevent homelessness or a return to institutions. These populations include the following:

- Elderly and frail elderly
- People with disabilities
- Mentally Ill Persons
- People with alcohol or other drug addictions
- People with HIV/AIDS
- People who have been abused/victims of domestic or sexual violence
- Refugees and immigrants and English language learners

The City of Kent's role in serving these populations is multifaceted. For example, the City funds programs to serve these populations, assists organizations in identifying needs and planning services for non-homeless populations, advocates for legislation and policies to anticipate and respond to the needs of these populations and helps these them navigate through the system of services that are available in the community.

Including the elderly, frail elderly, persons with disabilities (mental, physical, developmental), persons with alcohol or other drug addictions, persons with HIV/AIDS and their families, public housing residents and any other categories the jurisdiction may specify, and describe their supportive housing needs

Elderly and Frail Elderly

- Affordable housing resources for elderly persons are provided by the King County Housing Authority, private non-profit agencies and private owners. Units are available in a variety of developments, including Harrison House, Mardi Gras, Gowe Court, and Meeker Court
- City services include programs that install accessibility improvements, provide socialization, recreation, classes, nutrition and physical and mental health services for elderly Kent residents.
- Service gap: culturally-responsive services at the Senior Center targeted to immigrants and refugees; however Human Services staff and Senior Center staff are working to make services more accessible
- Community services including information and assistance, legal advocacy for low-income seniors, home-sharing coordination, Meals on Wheels, and transportation to medical appointments are coordinated on a county-wide basis by Senior Services of King County; these services are accessed by phone by residents throughout the county, including in Kent
- Other supportive services to keep seniors in their own homes are coordinated by the state Medical Assistance Division, through contracts with local providers including Visiting Nurses Service, Elderhealth Northwest, and private contractors; these services include nursing and chore services under a Medicaid waiver to avoid institutionalization
- Service gap: as state revenues shrink, supportive services to keep seniors in their own homes are at-risk for funding reductions
- The King County METRO ACCESS program provides transportation for elderly and disabled persons

Developmental/Physical Disabilities

- Integrated Living Services operates both a group home and an intensive tenant support program for persons with severe developmental disabilities
- Total Living Concept provides support meetings for parents and caregivers
- SKCAC employs adults with disabilities
- Aegis of Kent has senior housing for people living with Alzheimer's or dementia
- Service gap: the need for senior assisted living housing will increase as the population continues to age
-

Mental Illness

- Housing is provided by King County Housing Authority, Multi-Service Center, Catholic Community Services and private owners
- Crisis intervention and counseling services are offered in Kent School District schools; these services identify and refer youth with severe behavioral and emotional disturbances to appropriate providers of children's mental health services
- National Alliance of Mental Illness (NAMI) of South King County sponsors free support groups and education programs, and advocates for improvements to the mental health delivery systems in terms of access to care, standards of care, recovery, housing, jobs, and rehabilitation
- Counseling and mental health services are provided by Sound Mental Health, HealthPoint, Kent Youth and Family Services, Valley Cities Counseling and Consultation Services and Highline Mental Health Center
- Recovery Centers of King County, Sound Mental Health, Hope Recovery Services provides substance abuse treatment
- Alcoholics Anonymous, Narcotics Anonymous, Al-Anon and Al-Ateen groups are all available at a variety of times and sites in the City of Kent

Describe programs for ensuring that persons returning from mental and physical health institutions receive appropriate supportive housing

A variety of supportive housing services are available for persons discharged from mental and physical health institutions. Assisted living facilities such as Farrington Court, Arbor Village and Aegis of Kent offer assistance with activities of daily living based on individual needs, although they do not provide complex medical services. Other examples include service-enriched housing for people with mental health disabilities at Sound Mental Health, units for individuals with physical disabilities or frailties at Mercy Housing-Appian Way Apartments, fully accessible units for people with disabilities at King County Housing Authority, and transitional housing at Catholic Community Services for women in recovery who are discharged from the criminal justice system.

Specify the activities that the jurisdiction plans to undertake during the next year to address the housing and supportive services needs identified in accordance with 91.215(e) with respect to persons who are not homeless but have other special needs. Link to one-year goals. 91.315(e)

The City of Kent will use CDBG to fund the Home Repair Program that provides services to low and moderate income homeowners with priority for senior and disabled households and ReWA, Systems Navigation Program designed to assisted families and individuals navigate the service system.

For entitlement/consortia grantees: Specify the activities that the jurisdiction plans to undertake during the next year to address the housing and supportive services needs identified in accordance with 91.215(e) with respect to persons who are not homeless but have other special needs. Link to one-year goals. (91.220(2))

While an array of services is available in Kent and in South King County, a significant number of underfunded needs exist, many of which are basic human requirements. The items will be considered in relation to the detailed strategic approaches outlined in several community plans affecting the City of Kent, including, but not limited to: City of Kent Building a Health Community for Human Services, City of Kent Comprehensive Plan; Preserving and Strengthening Specialized Community Organizations: Capacity Assessment Interviews of Ethnic-based Community Organizations Located in the City of Kent Report, the King County Task Force on Regional Human Services; the King County Ten-Year Plan to End Homelessness; the South King County Plan to End Homelessness; and the United Way of King County Strategic Plan.

The City will advocate and/or support the needs outlined below:

Affordable Housing

- Programs that support affordable rental housing
- Additional shallow subsidy programs
- Acquisition and rehabilitation of foreclosed properties

Homeless Housing

- Permanent supportive housing for disabled homeless persons, especially for chronic homeless persons

Services for Persons with Disabilities

- Expanded mental health and substance abuse outpatient treatment options in Kent
- Improved public transportation
- Comprehensive mental health services in Kent
- Handicapped accessibility improvements for homeowners
- Additional at-home care services for severely disabled persons to replace recent funding reductions

Other Supportive Services

- Basic needs, including assistance with emergency housing costs, food, utilities and transportation costs
- Increased employment/job readiness/placement services
- Affordable childcare, including and before/after school childcare
- Increased case management services, including during evening hours
- Expanded transportation during off-hours and on east/west cross county routes
- A range of culturally-responsive services for immigrants and refugees, including translation services
- Access to affordable health care to replace losses from recent funding reductions
- Expanded domestic violence prevention activities, including programs designed for immigrants and refugees
- Expansion of mental health counseling services (including for children)
- Eviction prevention services

MA-40 Barriers to Affordable Housing

Negative Effects of Public Policies on Affordable Housing and Residential Investment

“Affordable housing” is defined by the City Comprehensive Plan as “adequate, appropriate shelter, costing no more, with utilities, than 30% of the household’s gross monthly income”. Affordable housing is critical to low/ moderate-income families because of their limited disposable income.

As required by the State Growth Management Act, the City of Kent’s Comprehensive Plan is consistent with the King County Countywide Planning Policies in support of housing affordability. The Countywide Planning Policies require that all jurisdictions “provide for a diversity of housing types to meet a variety of needs and provide for housing opportunities for all economic segments of the population.” The policies further call on jurisdictions to participate in an equitable distribution of low-income and moderate-income housing throughout the County.

Factors that Increase the Cost of Housing Development

One of the primary barriers to development of affordable housing in Kent, as in all areas of King County, is the cost and availability of raw land. As the population has concentrated in the urban Puget Sound area, the results are escalating land costs and rising development costs. Moreover, the slow recovery of the housing market is deterring developers.

Other barriers to the development of affordable housing include:

- Large lot sizes for single family homes
- Requirements for mitigation of environmental impacts which increase the cost of sewer and other housing design elements, and which reduce the number of units that can be built on a given piece of land
- Extended review times and processes for SEPA and other regulatory review of plans
- Impact fees for schools, roads and other community infrastructure

Two additional factors affect the ongoing cost of housing. Both are largely outside the control of the City of Kent. The first is the State of Washington’s reliance on the property tax as a primary source of state income.

The second contributing factor is a steep increase in utility costs over the past several years, which makes the operation of all housing significantly more expensive. Particularly for residents of older housing stock, which may lack adequate insulation, increases in utilities can be burdensome. However, rebates, grants, and tax credits from energy utilities and the federal government have increased energy efficiencies as well as alleviated some of the cost burdens of retrofits.

MA-45 Non-Housing Community Development Assets

Introduction

Kent has a favorable location in terms of the central Puget Sound economic region as it lies between the major ports of Seattle and Tacoma connected by freeways and an improving public transportation links provided by metropolitan buses and the Sounder Commuter Train. In addition, its location is generally central within the largest metropolitan area in the Pacific Northwest on trade routes to Canada and Asia. The 1990's saw the County make extraordinary growth in employment, population and wages. At the same time, the area was continually reducing its once significant dependency on the aerospace industry as a major engine for the economy. A high-tech job boom occurred as information technology and research added to the diversity of jobs in the economy. The major sectors in the County, with more than 100,000 estimated jobs at the beginning of 2012 included professional, scientific and technical services, retail trade, health care, leisure and hospitality, and government. It is anticipated that jobs in the government sector will continue to decrease until/unless tax revenues increase substantially.[1]

Overall employment has tended to fluctuate over the past 10 years as it has in most of the country as a result of the impact of the economic recession. In 2000 total employment stood at 60,700 increasing steadily to 2007 when it peaked at 64,500 before dropping to 60,300 in 2010. The industrial area of Kent has geographically been the dominate employment area with 36,440 jobs in 2010, followed in the distance by Downtown Kent at 4,380 jobs.[2]

Over the past century, Kent has transformed from a predominately agricultural community to a diverse economy with no dominate sector of employment and very limited agriculture.

- The sector of management, business and financial is the largest employer, but still only accounts for 28% of the jobs in the City
- Wholesale/transportation/utilities is the second largest employer (26%)
- Manufacturing jobs account for 22% of the employment
- Government/education and retail account for 9% each in employment
- Agriculture jobs make up less than 1% of the employment sector

The employment base has been anything but constant in recent years: in 1995 manufacturing dominated at 36% before dropping to 22% of the total jobs in Kent by 2010. The Puget Sound Regional Council anticipates a continued decline in the number of manufacturing jobs and a decline in the proportion of these jobs to total jobs in the region. By 2030, manufacturing jobs should account for just 23% of the jobs in the Green River Valley.

Downtown Kent experienced significant revitalization and notable job growth since 2000 and now represents a major component of the area's economy and social life. Improvements to the historical district, construction of the King County Regional Justice Center, the development of ShoWare Center, and the Kent Station shopping center have created focal points for the Valley. Kent Station is an 18 acre mixed-used urban village located in the Kent downtown core. It includes a 14-screen theater, branch campus of Green River Community college, national and local retail shops, and restaurants. Apartment construction is planned along with other retail development. By 2010, the downtown area accounted for 5.5% of the City's \$696 taxable sales.

Because of its geographical location and available land, Kent has room for additional economic growth. It is estimated that several areas of the City have parcels of land which are available for greater infill development. The Downtown area includes 150 identified parcels where greater development is possible while both the East Hill and the West Hill have 130 parcels each fitting that category.

Economic Development Market Analysis

Business Activity

| Business by Sector | Number of Workers | Number of Jobs | Total Workers | Total Jobs | Share of Workers | Share of Jobs | Jobs less workers |
|---|-------------------|----------------|---------------|------------|------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| Agriculture, Mining, Oil & Gas Extraction | 148 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Construction | 3,598 | 2,204 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 7 | -1 |
| Manufacturing | 6,387 | 5,119 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 16 | 1 |
| Wholesale Trade | 1,989 | 4,968 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 15 | 10 |
| Retail Trade | 5,722 | 5,283 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 16 | 3 |
| Transportation and Warehousing | 3,866 | 2,311 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 7 | -2 |
| Information | 839 | 725 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate | 2,612 | 1,867 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 0 |
| Professional, Scientific, Management Services | 4,643 | 2,310 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 7 | -4 |
| Education and Health Care Services | 6,164 | 2,892 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 9 | -5 |
| Arts, Entertainment, Accommodations | 4,083 | 2,516 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 8 | -1 |
| Other Services | 1,763 | 1,408 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 |
| Public Administration | 1,408 | 1,204 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 1 |
| Total | 43,222 | 32,815 | 0 | 0 | 99 | 101 | 2 |

Table 39 - Business Activity

Data LED
Source:

Labor Force

| | |
|--|--------|
| Total Population in the Civilian Labor Force | 46,008 |
| Civilian Employed Population 16 years and over | 43,222 |
| Unemployment Rate | 6.06 |
| Unemployment Rate for Ages 16-24 | 21.48 |
| Unemployment Rate for Ages 25-65 | 3.98 |

Table 40 - Labor Force

Data Source: 2005-2009 ACS Data

Occupations by Sector

| | |
|--|--------|
| Management, business and financial | 12,345 |
| Farming, fisheries and forestry occupations | 172 |
| Service | 7,415 |
| Sales and office | 11,787 |
| Construction, extraction, maintenance and repair | 4,442 |
| Production, transportation and material moving | 7,061 |

Table 41 – Occupations by Sector

Data Source: 2005-2009 ACS Data

Travel Time

| Travel Time | Number | Percentage |
|--------------------|---------------|-------------|
| < 30 Minutes | 22,218 | 54% |
| 30-59 Minutes | 14,137 | 34% |
| 60 or More Minutes | 4,678 | 11% |
| Total | 41,033 | 100% |

Table 42 - Travel Time

Data Source: 2005-2009 ACS Data

Education:

Educational Attainment by Employment Status (Population 16 and Older)

| Educational Attainment | In Labor Force | | Not in Labor Force |
|---|-------------------|------------|--------------------|
| | Civilian Employed | Unemployed | |
| Less than high school graduate | 4,285 | 252 | 1,960 |
| High school graduate (includes equivalency) | 9,103 | 521 | 2,257 |
| Some college or Associate's degree | 12,132 | 662 | 3,028 |
| Bachelor's degree or higher | 9,877 | 389 | 1,304 |

Table 43 - Educational Attainment by Employment Status

Data Source: 2005-2009 ACS Data

Educational Attainment by Age

| | Age | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|---------|
| | 18–24 yrs | 25–34 yrs | 35–44 yrs | 45–65 yrs | 65+ yrs |
| Less than 9th grade | 233 | 951 | 879 | 977 | 678 |
| 9th to 12th grade, no diploma | 1,770 | 1,246 | 1,369 | 1,088 | 561 |
| High school graduate, GED, or | 3,074 | 3,627 | 3,531 | 4,754 | 2,037 |

| | Age | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|---------|
| | 18–24 yrs | 25–34 yrs | 35–44 yrs | 45–65 yrs | 65+ yrs |
| alternative | | | | | |
| Some college, no degree | 2,532 | 3,305 | 2,603 | 5,152 | 1,572 |
| Associate's degree | 726 | 1,321 | 1,191 | 2,256 | 253 |
| Bachelor's degree | 496 | 2,402 | 2,596 | 3,639 | 1,106 |
| Graduate or professional degree | 0 | 524 | 808 | 1,649 | 448 |

Table 44 - Educational Attainment by Age

Data Source: 2005-2009 ACS Data

Educational Attainment – Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months

| Educational Attainment | Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| Less than high school graduate | 21,345 |
| High school graduate (includes equivalency) | 32,879 |
| Some college or Associate's degree | 34,338 |
| Bachelor's degree | 52,676 |
| Graduate or professional degree | 62,977 |

Table 45 – Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months

Data Source: 2005-2009 ACS Data

Based on the Business Activity table above, what are the major employment sectors within your jurisdiction?

The major employment sectors are:

- Retail trade/transportation/warehousing-16%
- Wholesale Trade-15%
- Education and Healthcare Services-9%
- Arts/entertainment/accommodations-8%

Describe the workforce and infrastructure needs of the business community:

The presence of marquee businesses, like Boeing, REI and others offer an opportunity to elevate Kent's image. Testimonials from companies with strong brands can promote Kent as a location for business success.

Stakeholders cite positive relationships with the City overall and a call to consider the effect of all regulatory decisions on local businesses. The following concerns were raised but do not represent consensus:

- Traffic impact fees and other regulatory and development requirements present hardships for some businesses, while others praise City leadership, staff and processes overall
- Utility rates are reportedly higher than in other places
- Decisions aren't always made with input from business community; city may not realize unintended consequences of policies
- Stakeholders compared Kent to Seattle and explained Kent's business-friendly atmosphere as a comparative advantage; additional improvements to communication strategies and transparency in fees and regulations are important to local business planning
- Reduction of traffic congestion in the downtown core during prime-time commuter hours
- Scarcity of highly educated people in the workforce
- More highly educated workforce

Describe any major changes that may have an economic impact, such as planned local or regional public or private sector investments or initiatives that have affected or may affect job and business growth opportunities during the planning period. Describe any needs for workforce development, business support or infrastructure these changes may create

The City of Kent was awarded a \$20,000 grant from United Way of King County New Solutions Fund to initiate the Kent East Hill Revitalization (KEHR) Project. The first meeting to launch this project was held in March 2012. The goal is to “make East Hill the best neighborhood in the region,” by creating and fostering a thriving diverse neighborhood through community collaboration and leadership development. Phase One of KEHR has been completed, and the City has a framework for revitalizing the area. Next steps will focus upon the following items:

- Leadership development - providing tools for veteran community leaders to continue doing good work and fostering new leaders to rise
- Organizational development - galvanizing, organizing and mobilizing necessary resources, both human and material, to support revitalization
- Building capacity for the community to take more and more ownership as the consultant’s role decreases

The business community is a vital partner in KEHR and will guide workforce development, business support and infrastructure changes instrumental to the success of the project.

How do the skills and education of the current workforce correspond to employment opportunities in the jurisdiction?

Table 44 shows the highest level of education achieved by residents age 18 and older as captured by the 2006-2009 American Community Survey. A significant number of Kent residents between the ages of 18 to 65 lacked a high school diploma or equivalent (16%). At the higher end of education scale, substantially fewer Kent residents between the ages of 25 to 65 had a BA degree or higher (25%) than was true in King County between 2006-2010 (45%) or Washington State (31%).

Education level is an important predictor of both employability and earnings. The higher the education level, the lower the rate of unemployment and the higher the earnings. For example, in 2011 the unemployment rate was less than 5% for those with graduate or professional degrees while 14% of persons without high school diplomas were unemployed (Table 47).

| Unemployment (%) | Education Attained | Median Weekly Earnings |
|------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|
| 2.5 | Doctoral degree | \$1,551 |
| 2.4 | Professional degree | \$1,665 |
| 3.6 | Master’s degree | \$1,263 |
| 4.9 | Bachelor’s degree | \$1,053 |
| 6.8 | Associate degree | \$768 |
| 8.7 | Some college, no degree | \$719 |
| 9.4 | High school graduate | \$638 |
| 14.1 | Less than a high school diploma | \$451 |
| 7.6 | <i>Average</i> | <i>\$797</i> |

Table 47: Earnings and Unemployment by Level of Educational Attainment, 2011

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Describe any current workforce training initiatives, including those supported by Workforce Investment Boards, community colleges and other organizations. Describe how these efforts will support the jurisdiction's Consolidated Plan

- Green River Community College is a Collegiate Training Initiative Institutional Participant with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) to train future air traffic control (ATC) specialists. A number of those receiving an Associate Degree in ATC are hired by the FAA. One of the goals of the FAA is to achieve cultural diversity in its workforce. Green River's Aviation Technology and Air Transportation degree programs also prepares students for careers in aircraft dispatch, professional pilot, helicopter pilot, and air transportation.
- Renton Technical College, which is located in a neighboring jurisdiction and is open to Kent residents, partners with the Washington Aerospace Training Resource Center to provide skilled aerospace assembly mechanics for local aerospace companies; 76% of students in workforce training programs at RTC are employed after graduation
- These initiatives support the City's Consolidated Plan by offering economic opportunities to residents.

Does your jurisdiction participate in a Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS)?

Yes

If so, what economic development initiatives are you undertaking that may be coordinated with the Consolidated Plan? If not, describe other local/regional plans or initiatives that impact economic growth.

The Workforce Development Council of Seattle-King County Local Strategic Plan for 2009-2011 includes Action Steps for the Automotive Work Force. The Employment Security Department projected an up to 19% gain in automotive-related occupations; certified technicians, in particular, are predicted to be in demand over several decades. A potential initiative is to explore how to provide information to youth on these occupations, the education and training required, etc. Youth could be assisted with enrolling in community college-related programs and business classes in preparation for owning automobile repair businesses someday.

In addition, the City will encourage the Workforce Development Council to add sites and affiliates in the Kent area. This would increase access to jobs and training for Kent residents. A second initiative for economic development is to increase economic self-sufficiency by supporting micro-enterprise businesses. For several years, the City has invested in programs that provide business training and counseling to create and expand micro-enterprise businesses. The City will continue its investment in this initiative.

Discussion

MA-50 Needs and Market Analysis Discussion

Are there any populations or households in areas or neighborhoods that are more affected by multiple housing problems?

Housing conditions vary throughout Kent, both in quality and age as noted by the following discussion of housing in Kent neighborhoods:

Valley Neighborhoods

Housing in the valley neighborhoods is considerably older than in the plateau neighborhoods - with the exception of homes recently built in the northern sector of the North of James neighborhood and a few infill units in the South of Willis neighborhood. The generally good quality of construction and size of these new homes reflects a strong confidence on the part of investors and owners and bodes well for the continued viability of the surrounding area. In addition, both neighborhoods show signs of owner investment in the older housing stock, demonstrated by improved condition and recent rehabilitation of some homes.

While there are some exceptions, most blocks contained a mix of both well-maintained and poorly-maintained units. As a general rule, houses located near the railroad tracks are in worse condition than houses further from the tracks. Neighborhoods would benefit from continued support of the housing rehabilitation program to improve some of the more dilapidated homes.

West Plateau Neighborhoods

Homes in the West Plateau area have experienced deterioration due to a number of factors. There has been an increase in the number of rental units owned by out-of-state landlords, an increase in the number of low-income families living in the area, and deferred maintenance on many units. Poor economic conditions may signal continued deterioration, particularly in Del Mar West where over one-half of the housing shows a need for improvement. Programs to arrest and reverse this decline might be considered in the future.

East Hill Neighborhoods

East Hill Neighborhoods contain a greater number of well-maintained housing, with the exception of some neighborhoods with deteriorating units. The overall condition of housing in the East Hill neighborhoods is much better than in the valley. The Panther Lake area has a greater mix of single family owned neighborhoods vs. rental homes. There is a good mix of older, fairly well-maintained to well-maintained housing in newer neighborhoods. While there are exceptions, overall, housing in the Panther Lake area is in fair to good condition. It must be noted that this recent annexation area is not yet recognized in HUD's system and is therefore not represented in any of the tables in this document. The Panther Lake area also has approximately eight Manufactured/Mobile home parks. The Kenton Firs area has more poorly maintained neighborhoods of manufactured housing with considerable homeownership. Residents of the Pantera Lago neighborhood pay lot space rent. Because of age and condition, both developments benefit from the home repair program.

Are there areas in the Jurisdiction where these populations are concentrated?

As stated previously, housing conditions vary throughout the neighborhoods highlighted-above. Low-income households are located throughout the city. There is a high concentration on the valley floor and East Hill. Racial and ethnic minorities are most highly concentrated on the East Hill.

What are the characteristics of the market in these areas/neighborhoods?

The valley floor has the most affordable housing in the City both for home ownership and to rent. East Hill rents vary as do home ownership opportunities. The majority of the subsidized housing is on East Hill. The highest concentration of senior housing is in the Valley. The greatest majority of the senior housing is subsidized. Neither area has a large selection of housing appropriate for large or extended families which are needed by the racial and ethnic communities.

Are there any community assets in these areas/neighborhoods?

Community assets include the people, micro-enterprise and small businesses, produce markets, faith-based institutions, schools, community spaces, King County Housing Authority and its residents, ethnic restaurants, grocery stores, an event center, etc.

Are there other strategic opportunities in any of these areas?

The City is working on the Kent East Hill Revitalization Project and will weigh investing in other communities. Lessons learned from KEHR will serve as a marker.

Strategic Plan

SP-05 Overview

Strategic Plan Overview

The Strategic Plan includes several key points:

- **Geographic Priorities:** Based on its analysis of needs, the City decided not to set priorities on a geographic basis; rather, residents in all areas of the City have priority needs.
- **Priority Needs:** This section will explain the rationale for establishing priorities based on data, citizen participation, resident/stakeholder survey results, interviews, etc.
- **Influence of Market Conditions:** The Strategic Plan will include a housing strategy, which will indicate how the characteristics of the housing market influenced the City's decisions on how to allocate funds; e.g., rental assistance, rehabilitation of old units and/or the acquisition of existing units.
- **Anticipated Resources:** Anticipated resources serve a primary role in determining strategies and goals.
- **Institutional Delivery Structure:** This section identifies potential sub-recipients and partners that will undertake the objectives outlined in the Strategic Plan
- **Goals:** The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) selected twenty-two (22) Goal Outcome Indicators that jurisdictions must use to specify proposed numeric accomplishments that the City aspires to achieve during the five-year Strategic Plan; goals must connect with priority needs.
- **Public Housing:** Explains how the City's Strategic Plan meets the needs of public housing residents and King County Public Housing developments.
- **Barriers to Affordable Housing:** This section identifies the City's strategies for removing or mitigating public policies that are barriers to affordable housing.
- **Homelessness Strategy:** This section describes the City's strategy for reducing and ending homelessness through outreach, shelter activities, rapid re-housing, and homeless prevention. It includes both housing and supportive services.
- **Lead-based Paint Hazards:** This section covers the proposed actions the City will take to evaluate and reduce lead-based paint hazards.
- **Anti-Poverty Strategy:** This section will summarize the City's goals, programs, and policies for reducing family poverty.
- **Monitoring:** In this area, the City will describe the standards and procedures used to monitor sub-recipients.

SP-10 Geographic Priorities

Geographic Area

1. Area Name:

Area Type:

Identify the neighborhood boundaries for this target area.

Include specific housing and commercial characteristics of this target area.

How did your consultation and citizen participation process help you to identify this neighborhood as a target area?

Identify the needs in this target area.

What are the opportunities for improvement in this target area?

Are there barriers to improvement in this target area?

Table 46 - Geographic Priority Areas

General Allocation Priorities

Describe the basis for allocating investments geographically within the state

Low/moderate-income individuals and families reside in every geographic area of the city; therefore, the City does not use geographic boundaries as a basis for allocating investments.

SP-25 Priority Needs

Priority Needs

| Priority Need Name | Priority Level | Population | Goals Addressing |
|------------------------------|----------------|---|---|
| Homeless Prevention Services | High | Extremely Low Low Chronic Homelessness Families with Children Victims of Domestic Violence | Assistance to prevent and respond to homelessness Decrease isolation of at-risk seniors |
| Affordable housing | High | Extremely Low Low Moderate Large Families Families with Children Elderly Chronic Homelessness Individuals Families with Children veterans Victims of Domestic Violence Elderly Frail Elderly Persons with Physical Disabilities Victims of Domestic Violence Other | Assistance to prevent and respond to homelessness Affordable Housing to homeless & those at-risk |
| Economic Opportunities | High | Extremely Low Low Moderate Large Families Families with Children Public Housing Residents Chronic Homelessness Individuals Families with Children Victims of Domestic Violence Persons with Physical Disabilities Victims of Domestic Violence Other | Increase self-sufficiency |
| Services for at-risk seniors | High | Extremely Low Low Elderly Frail Elderly | Decrease isolation of at-risk seniors |

Table 47 – Priority Needs Summary

Narrative (Optional)

SP-30 Influence of Market Conditions

Influence of Market Conditions

| Affordable Housing Type | Market Characteristics that will influence the use of funds available for housing type |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Tenant Based Rental Assistance (TBRA) | Rent & utility increases High unemployment |
| TBRA for Non-Homeless Special Needs | Barriers to employment; e.g., Limited or non-English speaking skills, disabilities, age, very low income, etc. |
| New Unit Production | CDBG funds cannot be used for new unit production |
| Rehabilitation | Increased costs for rehabilitation Maintaining affordable housing stock Allowing aging homeowners to remain in their home |
| Acquisition, including preservation | Need to maintain and acquire public facilities to meet the social service needs of low/moderate-income residents |

Table 48 – Influence of Market Conditions

SP-35 Anticipated Resources

Introduction

The City of Kent anticipates having the following funding sources available over the next five years:

- CDBG
- City of Kent General Fund Allocation for Human Services

Anticipated Resources

| Program | Source of Funds | Uses of Funds | Expected Amount Available Year 1 | | | | Expected Amount Available Reminder of ConPlan \$ | Narrative Description |
|--------------|------------------|--|----------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|-----------|--|--|
| | | | Annual Allocation: \$ | Program Income: \$ | Prior Year Resources: \$ | Total: \$ | | |
| CDBG | public - federal | Acquisition Admin and Planning Economic Development Housing Public Improvements Public Services | 747,000 | 0 | 0 | 747,000 | 2,988,000 | |
| General Fund | public - local | Public Services | 850,000 | 0 | 0 | 850,000 | 4,500,000 | Set aside fund for human service allocations |

Table 49 - Anticipated Resources

Explain how federal funds will leverage those additional resources (private, state and local funds), including a description of how matching requirements will be satisfied

CDBG funds do not require a match. CDBG funding for public services and public facility projects is on a portion of the total funding required. Other funding is secured for the project.

If appropriate, describe publically owned land or property located within the jurisdiction that may be used to address the needs identified in the plan

N/A

Discussion

CDBG funds will be used to support eligible-activities in accordance with CDBG regulations.

SP-40 Institutional Delivery Structure

Explain the institutional structure through which the jurisdiction will carry out its consolidated plan including private industry, non-profit organizations, and public institutions.

| Responsible Entity | Responsible Entity Type | Role | Geographic Area Served |
|--------------------|-------------------------|----------|------------------------|
| | Government | Planning | Jurisdiction |

Table 50 - Institutional Delivery Structure

Assess of Strengths and Gaps in the Institutional Delivery System

Generally, the institutional delivery system is strong; however, a few gaps exist. Gaps include:

- The erosion of CDBG funds, while there is an increase in administrative costs-planning and administrative costs are capped at 15% of the City's CDBG allocation
- Consistent loss and decrease of funds to human services agencies
- Loss or temporary closing of human services agencies due to decrease in or lack of funding- EBCOs and small organizations are especially at-risk
- Strengths in the system include:
- Tremendous collaboration between nonprofits, businesses, faith-based institutions, government, foundations, residents, the Public Housing Authority, etc.
- Support of human services from City leadership
- Strong homeless service provider system
- Strong domestic/sexual assault prevention services system
- Educational institution located in Kent and surrounding communities
- Visionary leaders who are recognizing and support the needs of the residents of Kent and King County

Availability of services targeted to homeless persons and persons with HIV and mainstream services

| Homelessness Prevention Services | Available in the Community | Targeted to Homeless | Targeted to People with HIV |
|---|----------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|
| Homelessness Prevention Services | | | |
| Counseling/Advocacy | X | X | |
| Legal Assistance | X | X | |
| Mortgage Assistance | | | |
| Rental Assistance | X | | |
| Utilities Assistance | X | | |
| Street Outreach Services | | | |
| Law Enforcement | | | |
| Mobile Clinics | X | X | |
| Other Street Outreach Services | X | X | |
| Supportive Services | | | |
| Alcohol & Drug Abuse | X | | |
| Child Care | X | | |
| Education | X | | |
| Employment and Employment Training | X | | |
| Healthcare | X | | |

| | | | |
|--------------------------|---|--|--|
| HIV/AIDS | | | |
| Life Skills | X | | |
| Mental Health Counseling | X | | |
| Transportation | X | | |
| Other | | | |
| Cultural navigation | X | | |

Table 51 - Homeless Prevention Services Summary

Describe how the service delivery system including, but not limited to, the services listed above meet the needs of homeless persons (particularly chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth)

The King County Committee to End Homelessness has developed a plan to coordinate the delivery of services throughout King County. While the system provides many services the length of the recession has impacted the ability of the system to meet the ever growing need particularly of families and youth. The budget crisis being faced by the State, County and City has resulted in cuts to mental health, primary medical, substance abuse and housing services at a time when the homeless population is growing. There is a critical need for employment, housing support services, mental health treatment and housing assistance in order to move people from homelessness to being housed.

For those able to access the system the services there are opportunities to move out of homelessness.

Describe the strengths and gaps of the service delivery system for special needs population and persons experiencing homelessness, including, but not limited to, the services listed above

Strengths

The county-wide systems for both homelessness and special needs allows funders and providers to coordinate services more effectively. This has resulted in having a single point of entry for homeless families and a county supported veteran services program. Services are coordinated at a regional level.

Gaps

There are still gaps in the system that in part are a result of the current economic crisis. There are more homeless now than five years ago and include:

- Youth and Young Adults
- Immigrants and Refugees
- Families
- Veterans

There is an increase in the need for emergency shelter for single adults that also provide support services. Services across the board are limited for veterans. Immigrants and refugees are without the resources to maintain their housing after government support is exhausted. The lack of employment opportunities for everyone has had a significant impact on the number of homeless and a reduction in opportunities for persons with special needs.

Provide a summary of the strategy for overcoming gaps in the institutional structure and service delivery system for carrying out a strategy to address priority needs

Service gaps will require additional funding resources that are currently not available. The City of Kent will continue to work with providers to develop strategies that will expand the use of resources by removing silos that have kept providers from being able to meet emergent needs. The institutional structure in King County has undergone significant change in the past five years and is currently working well.

SP-45 Goals Summary

Goals Summary Information

| Goal Name | Start Year | End Year | Category | Geographic Area | Needs Addressed | Funding | Goal Outcome Indicator |
|---|------------|----------|--|-----------------|--|----------------------|--|
| Assistance to prevent and respond to homelessness | 2013 | 2017 | Affordable Housing Homeless Refugees and immigrants | | Homeless Prevention Services Affordable housing | CDBG: \$370,250 | Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 280 Persons Assisted |
| Affordable Housing to homeless & those at-risk | 2013 | 2017 | Affordable Housing Homeless | | Affordable housing | CDBG: \$2,442,750 | Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 40 Persons Assisted Homeowner Housing Rehabilitated: 400 Household Housing Unit |
| Increase self-sufficiency | 2013 | 2017 | Non-Housing Community Development | | Economic Opportunities | CDBG: \$125,000 | Businesses assisted: 60 Businesses Assisted |
| Decrease isolation of at-risk seniors | 2013 | 2017 | Non-Homeless Special Needs | | Homeless Prevention Services Services for at-risk seniors | CDBG: \$50,000 | Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 85 Persons Assisted |

Table 52 – Goals Summary

Estimate the number of extremely low-income, low-income, and moderate-income families to whom the jurisdiction will provide affordable housing as defined by HOME 91.315(b)(2)

Kent does not receive HOME funds.

SP-50 Public Housing Accessibility and Involvement

Need to Increase the Number of Accessible Units (if Required by a Section 504 Voluntary Compliance Agreement)

N/A

Activities to Increase Resident Involvements

The King County Housing Authority increases resident involvement through a number of mechanism; e.g., the Resident Advisory Council was created as a forum for residents to provide feedback to assist KCHA with the development of policies and procedures that impact Housing Authority residents.

Is the public housing agency designated as troubled under 24 CFR part 902?

No

Plan to remove the ‘troubled’ designation

N/A

SP-55 Barriers to affordable housing

Barriers to Affordable Housing

“Affordable housing” is defined by the City Comprehensive Plan as “adequate, appropriate shelter, costing no more, with utilities, than 30% of the household’s gross monthly income”. Affordable housing is critical to low/ moderate-income families because of their limited disposable income.

As required by the State Growth Management Act, the City of Kent’s Comprehensive Plan is consistent with the King County Countywide Planning Policies in support of housing affordability. The Countywide Planning Policies require that all jurisdictions “provide for a diversity of housing types to meet a variety of needs and provide for housing opportunities for all economic segments of the population.” The policies further call on jurisdictions to participate in an equitable distribution of low-income and moderate-income housing throughout the County.

Factors that Increase the Cost of Housing Development

One of the primary barriers to development of affordable housing in Kent, as in all areas of King County, is the cost and availability of raw land. As the population has concentrated in the urban Puget Sound area, the results are escalating land costs and rising development costs. Moreover, the slow recovery of the housing market is deterring developers.

Other barriers to the development of affordable housing include:

- Large lot sizes for single family homes
- Requirements for mitigation of environmental impacts which increase the cost of sewer and other housing design elements, and which reduce the number of units that can be built on a given piece of land
- Extended review times and processes for SEPA and other regulatory review of plans
- Impact fees for schools, roads and other community infrastructure

Two additional factors affect the ongoing cost of housing. Both are largely outside the control of the City of Kent. The first is the State of Washington’s reliance on the property tax as a primary source of state income.

The second contributing factor is a steep increase in utility costs over the past several years, which makes the operation of all housing significantly more expensive. Particularly for residents of older housing stock, which may lack adequate insulation, increases in utilities can be burdensome. However, rebates, grants, and tax credits from energy utilities and the federal government have increased energy efficiencies as well as alleviated some of the cost burdens of retrofits.

Strategy to Remove or Ameliorate the Barriers to Affordable Housing

Strategies to remove or ameliorate the barrier to affordable housing include:

- Preserve the existing stock of affordable housing by providing home repair assistance to low/moderate-income households
- Provide utility assistance to low/moderate-income households
- Support development of accessory dwelling units
- Encourage a mix of housing types
- Encourage small-lot and townhouse development

SP-60 Homelessness Strategy

Reaching out to homeless persons (especially unsheltered persons) and assessing their individual needs

The City prioritizes reaching out to the homeless and connecting them to services and resources; therefore, outreach to sheltered and unsheltered homeless has been funded for a number of years. If a business owner, a community member or City staff request outreach assistance, the request is responded to quickly. The PATH Outreach team attends community suppers, visits homeless shelters and frequent areas where it is known the homeless congregate.

Addressing the emergency and transitional housing needs of homeless persons

Since it began funding human services in the early 1970's, the city has led the region in responding to homeless persons. In 1995 the city partnered with Catholic Community Services and local churches to start HOME, a men's shelter hosted by churches, staffed by Catholic Community Services and funded in part by Kent. A considerable percentage of the city's human services dollars (42%) are allocated to homeless intervention and prevention services. All of our Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) public services funding is allocated to homeless and homeless prevention services.

In addition, a partnership with Kent Lutheran Church and Catholic Community Services allows the city to open a shelter during extreme weather. The Housing and Human Services office opens as a warming center during the same period.

The City developed a funding strategy that allows the housing provider to determine how housing funds are spent based on the need of the client. Options include rapid re-housing, move in assistance, rent subsidy, transitional housing, shelter, vouchers and utility assistance.

Helping homeless persons (especially chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth) make the transition to permanent housing and independent living, including shortening the period of time that individuals and families experience homelessness, facilitating access for homeless individuals and families to affordable housing units, and preventing individuals and families who were recently homeless from becoming homeless again.

The city commits a significant amount of staff time to projects directly related to addressing homelessness in our community and regionally. Staff serves on the following committees:

- South King County Forum on Homelessness
- Committee to End Homelessness (CEH) in King County, Inter-agency Council
- CEH Funders Group
- Seattle/King County Coalition on Homelessness Board of Directors
- United Way Out of the Rain Impact Committee

Through these committees staff have created and/or influenced major system changes as evidenced by the Ten-Year Plan to End Homelessness Mid-plan Review, the King County Family Homelessness Initiative, Coordinated Entry, Housing First, the Mobile Medical Van, and PATH Outreach Teams. Services evolving from these system changes are currently provided in Kent.

Help low-income individuals and families avoid becoming homeless, especially extremely low-income individuals and families who are likely to become homeless after being discharged from a publicly funded institution or system of care, or who are receiving assistance from public and private agencies that address housing, health, social services, employment, education or youth needs

The City led the effort to support a homeless medical van to provide medical care to the homeless. This is a vital service to the uninsured and to persons discharged from publicly funded institutions. Rent assistance grants are also provided to individuals and families to prevent eviction and eventual homelessness. Budget management classes and advocacy services are provided by funded agencies.

SP-65 Lead based paint Hazards

Actions to address LBP hazards and increase access to housing without LBP hazards

The Residential Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction Act of 1992 seeks to identify and mitigate sources of lead in the home. A high level of lead in the blood is particularly toxic to children aged 6 and younger. Lead can damage the central nervous system, cause mental retardation, convulsions, and sometimes death. Even low levels of lead can result in lowered intelligence, reading and learning disabilities, decreased attention span, hyperactivity and aggressive behavior.

A leading source of lead in the home is lead-based paint. Deteriorating paint, friction in sliding windows, lead on impact surfaces, as well as unsafe renovation practices can result in the accumulation of dust in the house and lead in the soil.

The presence of deteriorating paint, lead-contaminated dust, based paint hazards. According to a 1999 national survey of homes, 27% of all homes in the United States had significant lead-based paint (LBP) hazards. The national survey found that location in the country was a factor in the probability of hazards. Significant LBP hazards are more prevalent in the northeast (43%) than in the west (19%). Age of housing is also important and commonly used to estimate the risk of significant hazards in the home. Lead was banned from residential paint in 1978. The 1999 national survey found that 67% of housing built before 1940 had significant LBP hazards. This declined to 51% of houses built between 1940 and 1959, 10% of houses built between 1960 and 1977 and just 1% after that. While housing in Kent is relatively new, 3% was constructed prior to 1940, 6% between 1940 and 1959, and 37% between 1960 and 1979. Given the changes in housing in Kent between 1990 and 2000, date of construction is the best indication of level of risk.

City of Kent home repair staff is trained in Safe Work Practices and presumes the presence of lead on repairs to housing built prior to 1978, meaning that safety measures are in place. Kent home repair staff has access to certified risk assessment inspectors when needed.

Home repair staff does not renovate six square feet or more of painted surfaces in interior projects or more than twenty square feet of painted surfaces for exterior projects in housing, childcare facilities or schools; therefore, federal law does not require that staff provide lead-based paint informational materials to homeowners. Auditors may verify this by reviewing home repair work orders.

How are the actions listed above related to the extent of lead poisoning and hazards?

The Public Health Department of Seattle and King County tests children who reside in King County for elevated blood levels, but the Department does not record data that is specific to Kent.

How are the actions listed above integrated into housing policies and procedures?

City of Kent home repair staff is trained in Safe Work Practices and presumes the presence of lead on repairs to housing built prior to 1978, meaning that safety measures are in place. Kent home repair staff have access to certified risk assessment inspectors when needed. In addition, the City identifies and mitigates the source of lead in Kent homes by:

- Assuring that homeowners served by the Home Repair Program where is evidence of lead based paint receive and comprehend the Lead Based Paint informational materials
- Assuring that Home Repair staff use the Lead-Safe Housing Rule Checklist for General Compliance Documentation as a guide to verify compliance with lead-based paint rules and that a Lead-Safe Housing Rule Applicability Form is completed on every Home Repair client
- Assuring adherence to and enforcement of lead-based paint abatement regulations

SP-70 Anti-Poverty Strategy

Jurisdiction Goals, Programs and Policies for reducing the number of Poverty-Level Families

Poverty is an issue facing almost 25% of Kent's residents. Although the City of Kent is a strong hub for business development and transportation to other areas providing job opportunities, rising unemployment rates caused by the current recession has forced many employers to downsize. The number of young and fragile families, often with one or more children, is growing.

Among the more expensive items for families to maintain are housing and utility costs, child care and transportation. The current, tenuous state of the human service infrastructure is creating further strain on low/moderate-income people seeking or trying to maintain employment. The City's anti-poverty strategy focuses on reducing the high cost of basic human needs while seeking innovative solutions to increasing basic income and the provision of supportive services.

A key part of the strategy is to provide a range of housing at affordable levels. Affordable rental assistance is provided to over 3,000 low/moderate-income Kent households through the King County Housing Authority and other sponsors of the Section 8 rental assistance program. The City supports the provision of additional vouchers for low- and moderate-income persons paying more than affordable rents.

For persons without housing or at-risk of eviction or displacement, Kent area homeless providers offer a continuum of housing and services in a cooperative effort through the Seattle/King County Continuum of Care, the South King Council of Human Services and the South King County Homeless Alliance. The City, in cooperation with other jurisdictions and providers will continue to pursue effective solutions to ongoing issues affecting individuals and families at or below 80% of the median income. To the greatest extent possible, the City will maintain the Human Services General Fund budget, providing over \$700,000 annually in funding for vital, basic needs human services programs.

The City will continue to work regionally and sub-regionally, in collaboration with other funders, including the King County HOME Consortium, the King County Housing Authority Weatherization Program, the South King County Planners group, as well as various human service provider groups to coordinate common housing and human service goals.

City of Kent staff will work closely with providers and case managers offering homeless housing and services in Kent, assisting clients with information, advocacy and job application assistance to maximize their benefits from programs for which they are eligible. In addition, programs serving the homeless and other low- and moderate-income persons are becoming increasingly skilled at providing clients with a range of services designed to meet their particular needs, including job skills training, job retention skills, job referral and counseling. Future funding within the timeframe of the plan could include services provided on an advocacy-based model, aimed at ongoing assistance with specific basic needs to increase job retention, employee work experience/ethic and assisting consumers to progress to earning living wage.

The City's economic development/jobs strategies will be pursued to support improved income, job expansion and job accessibility. Efforts will be made to develop partnerships with businesses and educational institutions to create works-site and distance learning strategies for job progression skills.

Also, the City will strive to increase business opportunities and jobs in the downtown core as development of the Kent Planned Action Site Project progresses.

How are the Jurisdiction poverty reducing goals, programs, and policies coordinated with this affordable housing plan

The City's poverty reducing goals, programs, and policies are coordinated with this Strategic Plan in several ways:

- Investment in micro-enterprise businesses
- Investment in emergency rental assistance grants and case management for refugees and immigrants
- Investment in eviction prevention grants
- Investment in shelters and transitional housing for the homeless
- Investment in healthcare services for the homeless
- Staff will convene a forum with organizations and institutions that specialize in employment services to increase employment opportunities for Kent residents

SP-80 Monitoring

Describe the standards and procedures that the jurisdiction will use to monitor activities carried out in furtherance of the plan and will use to ensure long-term compliance with requirements of the programs involved, including minority business outreach and the comprehensive planning requirements

Standards and Procedures for Monitoring

The City monitors its CDBG program throughout the year. Programs funded by the City are expected to maintain high standards. Organizations are informed that the failure to comply with contractual requirements and regulations could result in remedial actions and/or the termination of funding. Quarterly performance reports are reviewed by the Human Services Commission. Standards and procedures are further outlined below:

- Staff meets with newly funded projects before and/or during the contract year. Projects are monitored closely to ensure that staff has a good understanding of program administration, program performance standards, fiscal administration, contractual requirements, and recordkeeping and reporting. Issues that need clarification are addressed.
- At a minimum, all projects receive quarterly monitoring. Programs that need guidance in achieving performance measures or adhering to contractual requirements receive technical assistance, are required to attend a meeting with City staff, and/or receive an on-site monitoring visit.
- Monitoring concerns/finding are reviewed with agency staff and documented in writing.
- When applicable, corrective action is required on a timely basis. Additional time for corrective action may be allowed on a case-by-case basis.
- Agencies are required to provide supporting documentation verifying that deficiencies have been corrected.
- Failure to take corrective action could lead to the withholding or the loss of funding to a sub-recipient.

Housing and Human Services Division is responsible for developing the comprehensive plan chapters on housing and human services. Staff is participating in the current planning process for the County Comprehensive Plan(CCP) and is providing input into the needs for affordable housing. The CCP will set the targets for housing each jurisdiction must be. Staff is working toward including preservations and rehabilitation of affordable housing as a target.

Expected Resources

AP-15 Expected Resources

Introduction

The City of Kent anticipates having the following funding sources available over the next five years:

- CDBG
- City of Kent General Fund Allocation for Human Services

Anticipated Resources

| Program | Source of Funds | Uses of Funds | Expected Amount Available Year 1 | | | | Expected Amount Available Reminder of Con Plan \$ | Narrative Description |
|--------------|------------------|--|----------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|-----------|---|--|
| | | | Annual Allocation: \$ | Program Income: \$ | Prior Year Resources: \$ | Total: \$ | | |
| CDBG | public - federal | Acquisition Admin and Planning Economic Development Housing Public Improvements Public Services | 747,000 | 0 | 0 | 747,000 | 2,988,000 | |
| General Fund | public - local | Public Services | 850,000 | 0 | 0 | 850,000 | 4,500,000 | Set aside fund for human service allocations |

Table 53 - Expected Resources – Priority Table

Explain how federal funds will leverage those additional resources (private, state and local funds), including a description of how matching requirements will be satisfied

CDBG funds do not require a match. CDBG funding for public services and public facility projects is on a portion of the total funding required. Other funding is secured for the project.

If appropriate, describe publically owned land or property located within the jurisdiction that may be used to address the needs identified in the plan

N/A

Discussion

CDBG funds will be used to support eligible-activities in accordance with CDBG regulations.

Annual Goals and Objectives

AP-20 Annual Goals and Objectives

Goals Summary Information

| Goal Name | Start Year | End Year | Category | Geographic Area | Needs Addressed | Funding | Goal Outcome Indicator |
|---|------------|----------|--|-----------------|------------------------------|----------------|---|
| Assistance to prevent and respond to homelessness | 2013 | 2017 | Affordable Housing Homeless Refugees and immigrants | | Homeless Prevention Services | CDBG: \$74,000 | Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 56 Persons Assisted |
| Affordable Housing to homeless & those at-risk | 2013 | 2017 | Affordable Housing Homeless | | Affordable housing | CDBG: \$28,000 | Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 8 Persons Assisted |
| Increase self-sufficiency | 2013 | 2017 | Non-Housing Community Development | | Economic Opportunities | CDBG: \$25,000 | Businesses assisted: 12 Businesses Assisted |

Table 54 – Goals Summary

Estimate the number of extremely low-income, low-income, and moderate-income families to whom the jurisdiction will provide affordable housing as defined by HOME 91.215(b)

Projects

AP-38 Project Summary

Project Summary Information

| Project Name | Target Area | Goals Supported | Needs Addressed | Funding |
|---|-------------|---|------------------------------|-----------------|
| Kent Home Repair Program | | Affordable Housing to homeless & those at-risk | Affordable housing | CDBG: \$461,200 |
| City of Kent Planning and Administration | | | | CDBG: \$149,600 |
| Catholic Community Services | | Affordable Housing to homeless & those at-risk | Affordable housing | CDBG: \$10,000 |
| Multi-Service Center | | Assistance to prevent and respond to homelessness | Homeless Prevention Services | CDBG: \$49,000 |
| HealthPoint | | Assistance to prevent and respond to homelessness | Homeless Prevention Services | CDBG: \$10,000 |
| Refugee Women's Alliance-Case Management & EMS Assistance | | Assistance to prevent and respond to homelessness | Homeless Prevention Services | CDBG: \$15,000 |
| Washington CASH | | Increase self-sufficiency | Economic Opportunities | CDBG: \$25,000 |
| YWCA | | Affordable Housing to homeless & those at-risk | Affordable housing | CDBG: \$18,000 |
| Refugee Women's Alliance-Senior Meals | | | Services for at-risk seniors | CDBG: \$10,000 |

Table 55 – Project Summary

AP-35 Projects

Introduction

The projects funded by the City in 2013 address the priority needs of providing assistance to prevent and respond to homelessness, affordable housing to the homeless and increasing self sufficiency. Services include rent assistance to prevent eviction, healthcare services for the homeless, shelter and transitional housing, case management and emergency assistance for refugees, and micro-enterprise business classes to increase self-sufficiency.

| # | Project Name |
|---|---|
| 1 | Kent Home Repair Program |
| 2 | City of Kent Planning and Administration |
| 3 | Catholic Community Services |
| 4 | Multi-Service Center |
| 5 | HealthPoint |
| 6 | Refugee Women's Alliance-Case Management & EMS Assistance |
| 7 | Washington CASH |
| 8 | YWCA |
| 9 | Refugee Women's Alliance-Senior Meals |

Table 56 – Project Information

Describe the reasons for allocation priorities and any obstacles to addressing underserved needs

AP-50 Geographic Distribution

Description of the geographic areas of the entitlement (including areas of low-income and minority concentration) where assistance will be directed

N/A-funds are distributed throughout the jurisdiction.

Geographic Distribution

| Target Area | Percentage of Funds |
|-------------|---------------------|
| | |

Table 57 - Geographic Distribution

Rationale for the priorities for allocating investments geographically

Discussion

Affordable Housing

AP-55 Affordable Housing

Introduction

The City will provide rental assistance to prevent homelessness and rehabilitation assistance to keep Kent residents in their homes who might not otherwise be able to afford the upkeep for their homes.

| One Year Goals for the Number of Households to be Supported | |
|---|-----|
| Homeless | 0 |
| Non-Homeless | 121 |
| Special-Needs | 0 |
| Total | 121 |

Table 58 - One Year Goals for Affordable Housing by Support Requirement

| One Year Goals for the Number of Households Supported Through | |
|---|-----|
| Rental Assistance | 41 |
| The Production of New Units | 0 |
| Rehab of Existing Units | 80 |
| Acquisition of Existing Units | 0 |
| Total | 121 |

Table 59 - One Year Goals for Affordable Housing by Support Type

Discussion

Rental assistance is provided through the Multi-service Center Housing Stability Program and the Refugee Women's Alliance Emergency Assistance and Case Management Program.* The City of Kent also provides minor and major home repairs on homes owned by low/moderate-income Kent homeowners. *REWA provides both rental and utility assistance, and it cannot be determined at this point which type of assistance will be provided.

AP-60 Public Housing

Introduction

Public Housing residents have access to activities funded by the City; the City does not plan special activities for this population.

Actions planned during the next year to address the needs to public housing

All action planned during 2013 address the needs of PH residents. The Senior Nutrition and Wellness Program is held facility at Birch Creek Apartments, a PH facility.

Actions to encourage public housing residents to become more involved in management and participate in homeownership

None.

If the PHA is designated as troubled, describe the manner in which financial assistance will be provided or other assistance

N/A

Discussion

N/A

AP-65 Homeless and Other Special Needs Activities

Introduction

The City's goals and actions for reducing homeless are addressed in AP-20.

Describe the jurisdictions one-year goals and actions for reducing and ending homelessness including reaching out to homeless persons (especially unsheltered persons) and assessing their individual needs

The HealthPoint Healthcare for the Homeless Project has an outreach component to ensure that the homeless are aware of healthcare services. The City also funds outreach to the homeless through a General Fund-supported project.

Addressing the emergency shelter and transitional housing needs of homeless persons

The City funds the YWCA-Anita Vista Transitional Housing Program for homeless DV victims and CCS's Katherine's House Program is a transitional shelter for homeless women. The City also funds a housing continuum through the General Fund to meet the range of housing needs to prevent homelessness or transition someone into housing from homelessness.

Helping homeless persons (especially chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth) make the transition to permanent housing and independent living, including shortening the period of time that individuals and families experience homelessness, facilitating access for homeless individuals and families to affordable housing units, and preventing individuals and families who were recently homeless from becoming homeless again

The transitional housing programs supported by the City assist families and individuals in shelter or on the streets transition into housing. The REWA Emergency Management and Case Management Program helps families manage resources and prevents them from becoming homeless.

Helping low-income individuals and families avoid becoming homeless, especially extremely low-income individuals and families and those who are: being discharged from publicly funded institutions and systems of care (such as health care facilities, mental health facilities, foster care and other youth facilities, and corrections programs and institutions); or, receiving assistance from public or private agencies that address housing, health, social services, employment, education, or youth needs

Multi-service Center assists individuals and families with these issues. In addition, the city has a information and resource specialist who assists and counsels families who are released from the correctional facility and healthcare facilities.

Discussion

AP-75 Barriers to affordable housing

Introduction

The City works with the Economic and Community Development Department on these issues; however, no specific actions are planned for 2013.

Actions it planned to remove or ameliorate the negative effects of public policies that serve as barriers to affordable housing such as land use controls, tax policies affecting land, zoning ordinances, building codes, fees and charges, growth limitations, and policies affecting the return on residential investment

None.

Discussion

AP-85 Other Actions

Introduction

The City of Kent will enhance coordination by working with racial and ethnic minority providers to develop strategies that will allow them to co locate in a central location making access for clients easier. The City of Kent will continue work to reduce the number of families in poverty. Micro enterprise training, maintaining relationships with local training schools, encouraging business to hire low income residents and outreach increase opportunities for low income residents to obtain livable wage jobs. The City of Kent is committed to maintaining the affordable housing stock in our community. Using CDBG funds for the Home Repair Program allows home owners to maintain their homes and preserve the housing stock.

Actions planned to address obstacles to meeting underserved needs

A series of planning meetings with providers and representatives from racial and minority communities will be convened to develop an action plan to locating a facility in which to provide services. Neighboring cities will be invited to participate.

Actions planned to foster and maintain affordable housing

The City will continue its long-term collaboration and participation on Boards, committees, funding review teams, etc. to foster and maintain affordable housing for the South County Region. Through sub regional efforts elected officials and Land Use and Planning Board members will be educated about the need for and importance of affordable housing for the long term viability of the community.

Actions planned to reduce lead-based paint hazards

None

Actions planned to reduce the number of poverty-level families

Actions to reduce the number of poverty level families includes funding micro enterprise training, maintaining relationships with local training schools, encouraging business to hire low income residents and outreach increase opportunities for low income residents to obtain livable wage jobs.

Actions planned to develop institutional structure

None.

Actions planned to enhance coordination between public and private housing and social service agencies

The City has been instrumental in developing relationships between these entities and will continue to foster and participate in these collaborations including the Homeless Forum, a monthly meeting of housing and support service providers, South King Council of Human Services, South King County Housing Development Group, King County Housing Development Consortium.

Discussion

Program Specific Requirements

AP-90 Program Specific Requirements

Introduction

The City of Kent will use CDBG funds to benefit low and moderate income residents. The City will use the full amount allowable for Public Services and Planning and Administration with the balance being used for housing rehab services and economic development. The will not receive any program income from prior years. The city will allocate the full amount of funding available in the Annual Action Plan.

Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG)

Reference 24 CFR 91.220.(I)(1)

Projects planned with all CDBG funds expected to be available during the year are identified in the Projects Table. The following identifies program income that is available for use that is included in projects to be carried out.

| | |
|--|----------|
| 1. The total amount of program income that will have been received before the start of the next program year and that has not yet been reprogrammed | 0 |
| 2. The amount of proceeds from section 108 loan guarantees that will be used during the year to address the priority needs and specific objectives identified in the grantee's strategic plan. | 0 |
| 3. The amount of surplus funds from urban renewal settlements | 0 |
| 4. The amount of any grant funds returned to the line of credit for which the planned use has not been included in a prior statement or plan | 0 |
| 5. The amount of income from float-funded activities | 0 |
| Total Program Income: | 0 |

Other CDBG Requirements

| | |
|---|---------|
| 1. The amount of urgent need activities | 0 |
| 2. The estimated percentage of CDBG funds that will be used for activities that benefit persons of low and moderate income. Overall Benefit - A consecutive period of one, two or three years may be used to determine that a minimum overall benefit of 70% of CDBG funds is used to benefit persons of low and moderate income. Specify the years covered that include this Annual Action Plan. | 100.00% |

Discussion

The City will use all of its funds to benefit persons of low/moderate-income benefit.

Proposed CDBG Funding 2013

CDBG Funding Public Services 2013

| | | |
|-----------------------------|--|------------------|
| Catholic Community Services | Katherine's House and Rita's House | \$10,000 |
| HealthPoint | Health Care for the Homeless | \$10,000 |
| YWCA-Seattle-King-Snohomish | Anita Vista Transitional Housing | \$18,000 |
| Refugee Women\'s Alliance | ReWa Senior Nutrition and Wellness Program | \$10,000 |
| Multi-Service Center | Housing Stability | \$49,050 |
| Refugee Women\'s Alliance | Case Management and Emergency Assistance | \$15,000 |
| Total | | \$112,050 |

Contingency Plan

In the event of a funding **increase** the following will apply:

| | |
|-----------------------------|----------|
| Emergency Feeding | \$10,000 |
| Multi Service Center | \$20,000 |
| Catholic Community Services | \$7,000 |

Any remaining funds will be divided equally between the programs.

In the event of a funding **decrease** the following will apply:

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| ReWA-Senior Meals | (\$10,000) |
| ReWA- Case Managerment | (\$5,000) |
| YWCA | (\$18,000) |

Capital

| | | |
|---|---------------------------------|------------------|
| Washington Community Alliance for Self-Help | Kent Microenterprise Initiative | \$25,000 |
| Home Repair | Home Repair Services | \$460,550 |
| Total Capital | | \$485,550 |

In the event of a funding **increase** the following will apply:

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Home Repair | \$29,450 |
| Public Facility or Economic Development Project | \$100,000 |

In the event of a funding **decrease** the following will apply:

| | |
|--------|------------|
| WACASH | (\$25,000) |
|--------|------------|

| | | |
|------------------------------------|--|------------------|
| Planning and Administration | | \$149,400 |
|------------------------------------|--|------------------|

| | | |
|----------------------------------|--|------------------|
| TOTAL PROJECTED CDBG 2013 | | \$747,000 |
|----------------------------------|--|------------------|

2013 CONSOLIDATED PLAN CERTIFICATIONS

CERTIFICATIONS

In accordance with statutes and the regulations governing Consolidated Plan regulations, the City of Kent certifies that:

Affirmatively Further Fair Housing – The City of Kent will affirmatively further fair housing, conducting an analysis of impediments to fair housing choice within the jurisdiction, developing strategies and taking appropriate actions to overcome the effects of any impediments identified through the analysis, and maintaining records reflecting the analysis and actions taken to further the strategies and actions.

Anti-displacement and Relocation Plan – The City of Kent will comply with the acquisition and relocation requirements of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended, and implementing regulations at 49 CFR 24; and it has in effect and is following a residential anti-displacement and relocation assistance plan required under section 104(d) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended, in connection with any activity assisted with funding under the CDBG or HOME programs.

Drug Free Workplace – The City of Kent will continue to provide a drug-free workplace in accordance with the Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1988 (41 USC 701) by:

1. Publishing a statement notifying employees that the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensing, possession, or use of a controlled substance is prohibited in the grantee's workplace and specifying the actions that will be taken against employees for violation of such prohibition;
2. Maintaining an ongoing drug-free awareness to inform employees about:

- (a) The dangers of drug abuse in the workplace;
 - (b) The grantee's policy of maintaining a drug-free workplace.
 - (c) Available drug counseling, rehabilitation, and employee assistance programs; and
 - (d) The penalties that may be imposed upon employees for drug abuse violations occurring in the workplace;
- 3. Establishing a policy that each employee to be engaged in the performance of the grant be given a copy of the statement required by paragraph 1;
- 4. Notifying each employee in the statement required by paragraph 1 that, as a condition of employment under the grant, the employee will:
 - (a) Abide by the terms of the statement; and
 - (b) Notify the employer in writing of his or her conviction for a violation of a criminal drug statute occurring in the workplace no later than five calendar days after such conviction;
- 5. Notifying HUD in writing, within ten calendar days after receiving notice under subparagraph 4(b) from an employee or otherwise receiving actual notice of such conviction. Employers of convicted employees must provide notice, including position title, to every grant officer or other designee on whose grant activity the convicted employee was working, unless the Federal agency has designated a central point for the receipt of such notices. Notice shall include the identification number(s) of each affected grant.
- 6. Taking one of the following actions, within 30 calendar days of receiving notice under subparagraph 4(b), with respect to any employee who is so convicted:

- (a) Taking appropriate personnel action against such an employee, up to and including termination, consistent with the requirements of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended; or
 - (b) Requiring such employee to participate satisfactorily in a drug abuse assistance or rehabilitation program approved for such purposes by a Federal, State, or local health, law enforcement, or other appropriate agency;
- 7. Making a good faith effort to continue to maintain a drug-free workplace through implementation of paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6.
- 8. Providing the street address, city, county, state and zip code for the site or sites where the performance of work in connection with the grant will take place. For functions carried out by employees in several departments or offices, more than one location will be specified. It is further recognized that sites may be added or changed during the course of grant-funded activities. The City of Kent will advise the HUD Field Office by submitting a revised Place of Performance form. The City of Kent recognizes that the period covered by this certification extends until all funds under the specific grant have been expended.

Anti-Lobbying – To the best of the City of Kent’s knowledge and belief:

1. No Federally appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of it, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the awarding of any Federal contract, the making of any Federal grant, the making of any Federal loan, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement;
2. If any funds other than Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement, it will complete and submit Standard Form-LLL, "Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying," in accordance with its instructions; and
3. It will require that the language of paragraph 1 and 2 of this anti-lobbying certification be included in the award documents for all subawards at all tiers (including subcontracts, subgrants, and contracts under grants, loans, and cooperative agreements) and that all subrecipients shall certify and disclose accordingly.

Authority of Jurisdiction – The Consolidated Plan is authorized under State and local law (as applicable) and the City of Kent possesses the legal authority to carry out the programs for which it is seeking funding, in accordance with applicable HUD regulations.

Consistency with plan – The housing activities to be undertaken with CDBG, HOME, ESG, and HOPWA funds are consistent with the strategic plan.

Section 3 – It will comply with Section 3 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, and implementing regulations at 24 CFR Part 135.

Signature/Authorized Official

Date

Mayor Suzette Cooke

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Kent Law Department

Specific CDBG Certifications

The City of Kent, as an Entitlement Community, certifies that:

Citizen Participation – It is in full compliance and following a detailed citizen participation plan that satisfies the requirements of 24 CFR 91.105.

Community Development Plan – Its consolidated housing and community development plan identifies community development and housing needs and specifies both short-term and long-term community development objectives that have been developed in accordance with the primary objective of the statute authorizing the CDBG program, as described in 24 CFR 570.2 and 24 CFR, Part 570.

Following the Consolidated Plan – It will follow the five year-Consolidated Plan as approved by HUD.

Use of Funds – It has complied with the following criteria:

1. Maximum Feasible Priority. With respect to activities expected to be assisted with CDBG funds, the City of Kent certifies that it has developed its Action Plan so as to give maximum feasible priority to activities which benefit low and moderate income families or aid in the prevention or elimination of slums or blight. The Action Plan may also include activities which the grantee certifies are designed to meet other community development needs having a particular urgency because existing conditions pose a serious and immediate threat to the health or welfare of the community, and other financial resources are not available to meet such needs;
2. Overall Benefit. The aggregate use of CDBG funds including section 108 guaranteed loans during program year 2012 shall principally benefit persons of low and moderate income in a manner that ensures that at least 70

percent of the amount is expended for activities that benefit such persons during the designated period;

3. Special Assessments. The City of Kent will not attempt to recover any capital costs of public improvements assisted with CDBG funds including Section 108 loan guaranteed funds by assessing any amount against properties owned and occupied by persons of low and moderate income, including any fee charged or assessment made as a condition of obtaining access to such public improvements. However, if CDBG funds are used to pay the proportion of a fee or assessment that relates to the capital costs of public improvements (assisted in part with CDBG funds) financed from other revenue sources, an assessment or charge may be made against the property with respect to the public improvements financed by a source other than CDBG funds. Also, in the case of properties owned and occupied by moderate-income (but not low-income) families, an assessment or charge may be made against the property for public improvements financed by a source other than CDBG funds if the jurisdiction certifies that it lacks CDBG funds to cover the assessment

Excessive Force – It has adopted and is enforcing:

1. A policy prohibiting the use of excessive force by law enforcement agencies within its jurisdiction against any individuals engaged in non-violent civil rights demonstrations; and
2. A policy of enforcing applicable State and local laws against physically barring entrance to or exit from a facility or location which is the subject of such non-violent civil rights demonstrations within its jurisdiction;

Compliance With Anti-discrimination laws – The grant will be conducted and administered in conformity with title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 USC 2000d), the Fair Housing Act (42 USC 3601-3619), and implementing regulations.

Lead-Based Paint – The City of Kent’s notification, inspection, testing and abatement procedures concerning lead-based paint will comply with the requirements of 24 CFR 570.608;

Compliance with Laws – It will comply with applicable laws.

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------|
| _____ | _____ |
| Signature/Authorized Official | Date |
| Mayor Suzette Cooke | |

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Kent Law Department

APPENDIX TO CERTIFICATIONS

INSTRUCTIONS CONCERNING LOBBYING AND DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE REQUIREMENTS:

A. Lobbying Certification

This certification is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when this transaction was made or entered into. Submission of this certification is a prerequisite for making or entering into this transaction imposed by section 1352, title 31, U.S. Code. Any person who fails to file the required certification shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than \$10,000 and not more than \$100,000 for each such failure.

B. Drug-Free Workplace Certification

1. By signing and/or submitting this application or grant agreement, the City of Kent is providing the certification.
2. The certification is a material representation of fact upon which reliance is placed when the agency awards the grant. If it is later determined that the grantee knowingly rendered a false certification, or otherwise violates the requirements of the Drug-Free Workplace Act, HUD, in addition to any other remedies available to the Federal Government, may take action authorized under the Drug-Free Workplace Act.
3. Workplaces under grants, for grantees other than individuals, need not be identified on the certification. If known, they may be identified in the grant application. If the grantee does not identify the workplaces at the time of application, or upon award, if there is no application, the grantee must keep the identity of the workplace(s) on

file in its office and make the information available for Federal inspection. Failure to identify all known workplaces constitutes a violation of the grantee's drug-free workplace requirements.

4. Workplace identifications must include the actual address of buildings (or parts of buildings) or other sites where work under the grant takes place. Categorical descriptions may be used (e.g., all vehicles of a mass transit authority or State highway department while in operation, State employees in each local unemployment office, performers in concert halls or radio stations).
5. If the workplace identified to the agency changes during the performance of the grant, the grantee shall inform the HUD of the change(s), if it previously identified the workplaces in question (see paragraph three).
6. The grantee may insert in the space provided below the site(s) for the performance of work done in connection with the specific grant:

Place of Performance (Street address, city, county, state, zip code)

City of Kent

220 4th Avenue South

Kent, WA 98032

Check ____ if there are workplaces on file that are not identified here.

The certification with regard to the drug-free workplace is required by 24 CFR, Part 24, Subpart F.

7. Definitions of terms in the Non-procurement Suspension and Debarment common rule and Drug-Free Workplace common rule apply to this certification. Grantees' attention is called, in particular, to the following definitions from these rules:

"Controlled substance" means a controlled substance in Schedules I through V of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 812) and as further defined by regulation (21 CFR 1308.11 through 1308.15);

"Conviction" means a finding of guilt (including a plea of *nolo contendere*) or imposition of sentence, or both, by any judicial body charged with the responsibility to determine violations of the Federal or State criminal drug statutes;

"Criminal drug statute" means a Federal or non-Federal criminal statute involving the manufacture, distribution, dispensing, use, or possession of any controlled substance;

"Employee" means the employee of a grantee directly engaged in the performance of work under a grant, including: (i) All "direct charge" employees; (ii) all "indirect charge" employees unless their impact or involvement is insignificant to the performance of the grant; and (iii) temporary personnel and consultants who are directly engaged in the performance of work under the grant and who are on the grantee's payroll. This definition does not include workers not on the payroll of the grantee (e.g., volunteers, even if used to meet a matching requirement; consultants or independent contractors not on the grantee's payroll; or employees of subrecipients or subcontractors in covered workplaces)